

Spring 1-1-2011

An Anatomy of Dialogue in Teaching and Learning

Michael Patrick Zizzi

University of Colorado at Boulder, michael.zizzi@colorado.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.colorado.edu/comm_gradetds



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zizzi, Michael Patrick, "An Anatomy of Dialogue in Teaching and Learning" (2011). *Communication Graduate Theses & Dissertations*. Paper 26.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Communication at CU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Graduate Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CU Scholar. For more information, please contact cuscholaradmin@colorado.edu.

An Anatomy of Dialogue in Teaching and Learning

Michael Patrick Zizzi

Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Communication
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO

August / December, 2011

Doctoral Committee:

- Karen Tracy, Professor, Department of Communication
(Advisor/Dissertation Director)
- Robert Craig, Professor, Department of Communication
- Stanley Deetz, Professor, Department of Communication
- Bryan Taylor, Professor and Chair, Department of Communication
- R. Wayne Boss, Professor, Leeds School of Business

SIGNATURE PAGE

This thesis titled:
An Anatomy of Dialogue in Teaching and Learning
written by Michael Patrick Zizzi
has been approved for the Department of Communication

Karen Tracy, Professor of Communication
Committee Chair and Dissertation Director

Robert Craig, Professor of Communication
Committee Member

Stanley Deetz, Professor of Communication
Committee Member

Bryan Taylor, Professor of Communication
Committee Member

R. Wayne Boss, Professor, Leeds School of Business
(External Committee Member)

Date_____

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we
Find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards
of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

IRB protocol: 0107.40

Name: Michael Patrick Zizzi

Advised by: Karen Tracy

Dissertation Title: An Anatomy of Dialogue in Teaching and Learning

ABSTRACT

This doctoral dissertation presents discourse analysis of a semester-length program of faculty development at a large western university, seeing this particular educational setting as especially fertile for the identification and analysis of defining elements, processes, and characteristics as regards the study's focal interest: dialogue in teaching and learning. The study brings, to pedagogical understandings of the much idealized term *dialogue*, the sensitivities particular to communication-theory understandings of dialogue, largely those of engaging not just student voices, but *difference* therein, such that understandings and practices of educational dialogue become energized to not simply feature an interactive quality, but to further serve the ideals of bringing together disparate worldviews and ideas in an expressly productive dialogue, one rooted in ideals of social construction, wherein knowledge and identity, both, are constructed *in* communication, not conveyed *through* communication. The study, owing to the perspective of communication as practice, identifies and explores prevailing and "pervasive" dilemmas in the practice of dialogue in faculty training, as it also presents and tests the existing, if exploratory, three-stage model of the "pragmatics of dialogue" by Craig and Zizzi (2007). Key findings include, at the situational level, the utility of orienting faculty training in terms of technological training and, at the interactional level, the utility of conceiving educational dialogue not as a rare moment, but as a continuous process featuring identifiable highs and lows that may be nurtured into conceptual, relational, and practical productivity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to offer, first and foremost, my deepest appreciation to my advisor, teacher, and taskmaster (politically incorrect to say slave driver), Professor Karen Tracy. To such a gracious and great leader in our specialization of discourse studies, I hesitate to propose that “there are no words to express. . .” because she would likely answer back, “C’mon, Mike, the dictionary is filled with them!” I will, though, admit that my faculty for arranging Webster’s resources pales in comparison to the unrepayable debt I owe you, Karen, for life-changing inspiration, instruction, training, and support across six years of personal and scholarly transformation.

Likewise, I extend boundless appreciation to the other four members of my doctoral committee, starting with Professor Robert Craig, my first professor in the program and my communication-theory mentor, without whose instruction and encouragement, both, I never would have even made it into the program. To Professor Stan Deetz, I say thank you for helping me to reconfigure everything I ever knew about communication, especially regarding interpretation and identity. Now I know why I don’t know what I once thought I knew—and I owe it all to you! Thanks, also, to Professor Bryan Taylor for your supportive leadership and sky-high scholarly standards and for helping me to appreciate the “need for a great story” in qualitative research. Deepest thanks go out, as well, to Professor Wayne Boss, for your wisdom, support, and guidance across many important areas of my personal and academic life during the three challenging years I worked on this dissertation project.

Along with my first speech teacher (at Broome CC in NYS) and continued friend, Patricia Weller, I thank the memory and spirit of the late I. David Glick (professor/mentor at SUNY-Oswego), whose perpetual encouragement (harassment?) for almost twenty years finally succeeded in propelling me into doctoral study. Further, I will always hold fond memories of,

and hearty gratitude for, Professors Andy Wolvin and James Klumpp, chief inspirers in my MA program at the University of Maryland. Further, I must thank the director (pseudonym, “Nora Porter”) of the training program I studied for this dissertation, both for allowing my participation there and for starring in the analysis (couldn’t have done it without you, “Nora”!).

Of course I could name countless teachers, friends, and family members, here and gone, to whom I owe not just my world view, but my world. For the sake of brevity, I simply turn my gaze skyward to feel the proud smile of Mom, Dad, and Gram, while also extending my endless gratitude in the hear-and-now to my lifelong friends from “The Table,” my dear siblings and cousins, and my beloved aunts Angie, Peg, Ellen, and Marion—and, of course, also to my sons, Adam and Burke. All of you continue to provide me a wonder-full *raison d’être*. Touch and go never quite makes it to touched and went, when someone has angels—both heavenly and earthly—looking out for him. Thank you, all.

– MPZ

SIGNATURE PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
A Movement in Need of Movement	1
Theoretical Commitments Undergirding this Study	3
A Special Setting Needed, for Viewing a Special Phenomenon	7
In Search of Dialogue with a <i>Difference</i>	11
<i>Different</i> From What?	13
From Theories of <i>Difference</i> to Theories of <i>Practice</i>	16
Dialogue in Teaching: Preferred Mode of Communication and Instruction?.....	18
Structural Plan of the Dissertation	20
Summary of my Rationale and Intent	23
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:	25
REGARDING “DIALOGUE” IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS AND RESERCH AND IN CONTEXTS OF COMMUNICATION THEORY	25
Defining “Dialogue in Teaching and Learning”	25
Which Literature to Survey?	25
Overview of the Current Pedagogical Perspective on Educational Dialogue.....	27
Dominant Conceptualization of “Classroom Discourse” in Present Educational Literature: Transmission Due for an Overhaul	30
Existing Critiques of the Transmission Model in Pedagogical Contexts	34
Issues of Power: An Often Overlooked Undercurrent.....	38
A Power-Full Dilemma in Traditional Situations of Teaching and Learning	44
<i>Dialogue</i> in Educational Settings: Socratic Origins, Then and Now.....	49
From Socratic Method to Socratic Repertoire	51
Paolo Freire: Dialogue as Means of Liberation	52
Enter Technique, in the Form of “Triadic” Dialogue	56
<i>Dialogue</i> as Conceived and Discussed in Adult Education and Training Contexts	58
Recent and Relevant Discourse Analysis Employed in Pedagogy Literature	69
Sharpening the Focus upon the <i>Dialogic Situation</i> of Faculty Development Training.....	76
Not a Container, but a <i>Situation</i> that Shapes and Takes Shape	78
The Situation, as Ever-evolving Frame for the Making of Meaning.....	80
Summary of Dialogue in Pedagogy and its Need for Communication Theory	85
Roots of Dialogue as Conceptualized in Literatures that Inform Communication Theory	85
Modern Understandings of Dialogue in Communication Theory	86
Dialogue: Noun or Verb (or <i>Imperative!</i>)?	89
Grounding Dialogic Theory’s Deeper Roots in Interpretation and Identification.....	91
Enter Bakhtin and Critical Factors of Time and Space.....	93
Bakhtin’s Chronotope Meets Cissna and Anderson’s Dialogic Moment	94
Dialogue as Public Remedy? . . . or as Covert Mechanism of Control	96
Dialogue: “Magical Moment” . . . or Practical Tool.....	97
Seeking the Space Where Conflicting Stories Live Together—to Make New Stories.....	100
Research Question	101

CHAPTER 3:	103
RESEARCH SETTING AND EVENT:	103
DISCURSIVE ARENA FOR ANALYSIS	103
Research Site	103
Pedagogical Interests Special to the Research Site	105
Research <i>Scene</i> : Into the Vaunted “Center of Technology” Building, We Venture	114
Evolution of my Role, as Researcher (from Videotape Analyst to Participant-Observer)	116
Participants in the Study	122
CHAPTER 4:	124
METHODOLOGY	124
Primary Analytic Goal	124
Brief Overview of Discursive Event under Investigation	125
Overview of Definitions, Commitments, and Dialogue-Analytic Approach	126
Metatheoretical Stance: Communication as Practice, Cultivated	131
Specific Analytic Orientation: Language as Social Interaction (LSI)	134
Primary Data Collection (Digital Recordings of all Training Sessions)	136
Follow-up Data-review, Format Conversion, and Sequence Logging	138
Selection of Data for Analysis	140
Transcription System and Rationale	144
Secondary Data (Audio-recorded Interviews with Key Project Participants)	148
Transcription of Secondary Data	151
Human Subject Protection	152
CHAPTER 5:	155
DATA ANALYSIS, PART I: EXPLORING THE <i>DIALOGIC</i> (OR NOT) <i>SITUATION</i>	155
Situational Focus: <i>Participant Motivation</i> : “Why am I Participating in this Training?”	158
First Faculty Case in Point: Ike, Professor in the Natural Sciences	161
A Pervasive Dilemma in Faculty Development is Revealed	163
Observing the Dilemma through Ike’s Eyes	166
Another Dilemma Revealed: To Act as Critical Scientist or Amiable Classmate	168
Dom Confirms the Situational Dilemma	176
Peg Likewise Wonders, “I Can Teach Just Fine, but am I Ready to Teach Students <i>Nowadays</i> ?”	186
Flashpoint: “Peg’s Protest” Sparks Dialogue, from Situational Tension	191
Dialogic Turning Point of the Training Program	192
The End of the Session Five Becomes the Beginning of Situational Transformation	211
Analytic Summary of the Dialogic <i>Situation</i> at Hand	226
CHAPTER 6:	230
DATA ANALYSIS, PART II: DIALOGUE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING—ANATOMY OF A PROCESS: THREE STAGES AT THREE TEMPERATURES	230
Demonstrating Dialogic Discourse Analysis, through the <i>Pragmatics of Dialogue</i>	230
The Need for—and Development of—the <i>Pragmatics of Dialogue</i> Model	233
Case 1: Deciding upon a Time to Hold the Participants’ Weekly Online Chats	241
Case 2 (with screenshots): Julia Persists, and a Solution Emerges Dialogically	251
Case 3: “I Want to have a Dialogue”?	270
Of Winners and Losers, in the Pragmatics of Dialogue	278
Concluding Thoughts Regarding Dialogic Discourse Analysis, of Interaction	285

CHAPTER 7:	288
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	288
Summary	288
Summary of Analysis: Situation Level	288
Summary of Analysis: Interaction Level	292
Practical Application	294
Study Limitations and Directions for Future Research	296
Concluding Thoughts	298
REFERENCES	301
APPENDIX A: Transcription Key	324
APPENDIX B: Discursive Log of a Complete, Two-hour Training Session	325
APPENDIX C: Example of Handwritten Logs of a Two-hour Training Session	333
Session Log, Week-6.a, as Noted/Written Live, During Videotaping	333
Session Log, Week-6.b, Detailed, as Noted/Written During Dubbing to DVD	334
APPENDIX D: Training Session Excerpts	335
Training Session Excerpt 1: Dom, Ike, and NP Discuss Educational Philosophies	335
Training Session Excerpt 2: Nora and Group Discuss Scheduling of Weekly Online Chats	339
Training Session Excerpt 3: Peg's Protest, Part 1: Comments Made with Session Ending	341
Training Session Excerpt 4: Peg's Protest, Part 2: The Post-Meeting <i>Meeting</i>	346
Training Session Excerpt 5: The Group Discusses Problems Showing Films in Class	349
Training Session Excerpt 6: Peg and Dom Clarify their Problem	353
Training Session Excerpt 7: Julia Breaks Through, with a Breakthrough	360
Training Session Excerpt 8: Miriam Opens her Presentation with a Call for "Dialogue"	362
Training Session Excerpt 9: Ike Extols the Socratic Method	363
Training Session Excerpt 10: Miriam and Ike, in "Dialogue"?	365
APPENDIX E: Interview Excerpts	367
Interview Excerpt 1: Ike, Professor (Part 1)	367
Interview Excerpt 2: Ike, Professor (Part 2)	371
Interview Excerpt 3: Dom, Professor	373
Interview Excerpt 4: Julia, Graduate Assistant	376
APPENDIX F: Example of a Complete Interview: Peg, Professor	384
APPENDIX G: Participant Consent Form	404

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing band of people for whom the notion of “dialogue” crystallizes what the evidence on *learning* shows is most urgently needed and what the evidence on *teaching* shows is most palpably absent. In other words, a movement is gathering momentum. (Alexander, 2005, p. 10, emphasis added)

A Movement in Need of Movement

Notice, in the passage quoted above, from Robin Alexander, fellow, University of Cambridge, professor of education emeritus, University of Warwick, the simultaneous splitting off and joining up of two dialectical opposites, as seen in his “evidence on *learning*” as opposed to “evidence on *teaching*.” One is not surprised to see the dialectical pair thusly separated. Indeed, in any formalized learning setting—be it a classroom or other, perhaps off-site, training setting—there are students, and there are teachers. The roles are clear-cut and separate, including the defining characteristic that the teacher, unlike the student, is paid to be there and is held responsible for what transpires. Further, as indicated in the quoted passage, the two are often considered separately, not just in the classroom, but also in the literature, with separate evidence available, as Alexander offers, regarding the *needs of learners* and the *practices of teachers*.

The separation of the two roles is not extraordinary, nor does joining the two terms, in the one sentence, raise eyebrows. These are two terms that contrast well yet

belong together, in the dialectical sense that each term both opposes and so co-constructs the other; they imply each other, both in theoretical and practical ways. In the former, it is the act of learning that grounds the possibility of teaching, and in the latter, it is a pragmatic fact that the teacher cannot teach without a student. A barbed retort might note that this practical necessity works only in the one direction (a student *can* learn without a teacher, as through experience), but I am going to eclipse that criticism by bounding my attention, from this point forward, to institutional and formal learning settings where there is indeed a presumed teacher or trainer, one who, whether or not physically present at a given moment of learning (as in a moment perhaps occurring out of class), has worked expressly to facilitate that learning. In that sense, the teacher is *always* “present,” just as the student is likewise “present” while the teacher, sitting alone, plans for class.

In delineating the above, I foreshadow the theoretical stance of this study, a stance appropriate to my academic arena, which is not pedagogy, *per se*, but the study of *communication*. For, without wanting to delve deeply into philosophies regarding the duality of nature, I can state at face value that we, in communication theory, aided by Craig’s (1999) acclaimed heuristic, understand that the definitional *separation* of speaker and listener is not a matter of fact; rather, it is one of *perspective* and, for Craig, of tradition—in the cybernetic tradition, a scientific perspective; in the rhetorical tradition, a humanistic perspective—so, when the two terms are discussed separately, it is more of convenience (if not ignorance) than of theoretic solvency or analytic utility, except, perhaps, to the network administrator or speechwriter.

What I will critique in the upcoming review of the literature as the “transmission” model of communication, where sender and receiver are seen as separate until linked by a

message, nonetheless stands as a common view of communication, even though long exposed by many in our field (e.g., Deetz, 1990; Carey, 1989) as simplistic and of minimal utility as an analytic lens into much communicative activity and associated meaning making. This common oversimplification, if understandable, parallels simplistic views regarding the communicative activity central to this study, that of teaching and learning. Communication theorists have, for decades now, worked to intertwine *sender* and *receiver*. I, likewise, mean to inextricably unite, through dialogue, *teacher* and *learner*.

As I suggest in the title of this dissertation, my hope is to productively present an *anatomy of dialogue* within formalized educational settings, that is, within contexts where the central business at hand is understood by all parties to be expressly that of teaching and learning. Thereby, I aim to show—in both situational and interactional perspectives—how *talk* interacts with *talk*, among participants in the learning community at hand, a learning community comprised—in the case of this study—of academics gathered to improve their skills in curricular design, in a well-funded and high-profile event of faculty training.

Theoretical Commitments Undergirding this Study

Indeed, communication theory (through transactional, constitutive, postmodern, constructionist, and systems views, among other alternatives to the transmission model) continues to provide a basis for understanding the foundational *connectedness* (not the apparent or even convenient distinctions) between persons who are interacting, hence communicating. When this communicative interaction is discursive (in talk), we in

communication studies, especially those in the present sub-field of language and social interaction, more particularly discourse studies, refer to the interacting communicators not as separate senders and receivers, but as participants sharing the single designation: *interlocutors*: communicators engaged in a shared discursive activity, broadly a speech act, as pressed by Austin's (1962) foundational ideas of "doing things with words."

With discourse—that is, discursive data—awaiting my scrutiny and analysis, I propose to upgrade the view of communication from the "transmission model" that has traditionally operated in pedagogy literatures and practices (where teaching is one thing and learning, another) to a *constitutive* view that does not see separate senders and receivers alternating roles as they "transmit" meaning; rather, it sees continuously flowing interlocutors whose fluid identities are constructed, challenged, reconstructed, and, at all times, performed *in* and *by* "the communication." In other words, the communication does not carry meaning, it makes—it socially constitutes—meaning, a principle famously promulgated in Berger and Luckmann's (1967) slim and oft-cited volume, *The Social Construction of Reality*, and much theorized since. More narrowly, I ground my approach, interests, and analysis in a discursive perspective within the broader constitutive frame: the perspective of dialogism—multifaceted as the term, itself, appears in the literature—as I will survey and consider in necessary depth.

To go a bit deeper, the theoretical commitment I affirm regards communication, including dialogue, as constitutive of meaning as developed within and across communities of practice. Following Craig and Tracy (e.g., Craig, 1999; Craig, 2006; Craig & Tracy, 1995; Tracy & Craig, 2010), I thereby view communication in terms of *practice*, in which meaning is *constituted*, not simply a process by which meaning is

conveyed (the transmission model). As Deetz (e.g., 1990; 1992; Deetz & Simpson, 2004) expands the idea, communication—in creating and constituting both meaning and identity—is not merely a carrier of pre-held meaning among presumed “autonomous” individuals. The social construction perspective thereby undergirds and informs the work at hand, aided by the phenomenological orientation (Craig, 1999) of dialogism, itself.

By this reference to phenomenology, I mean to affirm a theoretical debt to Buberian ideals of I-Thou as drawn out, in relation to Rogers’s unconditional positive regard, by Cissna and Anderson (1997), which I consider a duly *practical* embodiment of Levinas’s “first philosophy of ethics” (1985, p. 77): a response-ability not just *to*, but *for*, Other, not to “reconcile difference” but to celebrate Other’s radical alterity. As Pinchevski (2005) interprets, “It is precisely in the irreconcilable difference of alterity that Levinas founds the fundamental relationship with the other” (p. 71).

Just as discourse analysts see not senders and receivers, but *interlocutors*, my approach to the study of this educational setting will therefore orient toward mutual processes of learning-oriented discursive engagement. Thereby, I will not focus *primarily* upon the obvious role distinctions between teachers and students; rather I will focus on illuminating the *mutuality* (this idea, a centerpiece of the Buberian perspective on dialogue) available within this communicative frame. In short, I seek to understand the bases and processes of free, open, and mutually beneficial (though not necessarily comfortable) discursive engagement among co-participants in an enterprise of learning.

Yes, there are role differences involved in and around the classroom or training setting, and with these role differences come status differences, just as we would find in any learning gathering—or any gathering, period. These roles and related differences will

be considered and accounted for in the analysis to follow. Indeed, the power differentials associated with the inherent differences in role and status (presumed differences between teachers and learners in formalized educational settings), present both resources for and barriers to the very kinds of talk—dialogue—that I seek to illuminate. My commitment to communication as constitutive—this view affirmed by more than two decades of voluminous teaching (over 300 university course sections taught, at last accounting)—orients me, however, more toward the *resources* of power than toward the *barriers* therein, though I readily acknowledge both. My experience is now informed, especially, in reflection aided by my doctoral studies, to move from ideas of power in education to *empowerment* there, including support in Dewey’s (1944) both civic and practical view of education.

I am therefore obligated to address “the problem of power imbalances” through what Foucault (1982/1994) cast as a “new economy of power relations” (p. 128). Or, following Judith Butler (1997), she also citing Foucault, I view power *not* as the problem, but hold “a view of power as formative and constitutive” (p. 132). Owing deeply, also, to Paulo Freire (e.g. 1970), I acknowledge the importance of roles and the prospectively oppressive power differences therein, but my primary focus, in the constitutive lens, will not be so much upon the *individuals*, rather upon both actualities and implied possibilities within the *talking* (Levinas’s the Saying as mediating identity more so than simply the Said), within the discourse, as the boundaries of participant roles become blurred—or shall I say *enlarged*, to the point of mutual overlap—through dialogue.

Furthermore, one more voice among dialogue theorists must be acknowledged, in terms of rounding out the central theoretical commitments of this study of dialogue in

teaching and learning, the voice of Mikhail Bakhtin. To use Bakhtinian (e.g., 1981; 1986) terms, understandings of educational dialogue are generally idealized as centripetal (pulling in) not centrifugal (spreading out). Seeking, exploring, challenging, creating—these are the centrifugal effects, when difference is courted and engaged, not simply tolerated (or not) then centripetally channelled inward toward a pre-set destination, likely back home to the center of the intended lesson. Bakhtin’s dialogic move toward the centrifugal *spreading out* during the construction of knowledge is central to the conceptual “movement” I hope to energize and inform, through my project, which I locate within the larger movement toward developing improved theory and practice regarding dialogic possibilities in the discourse of teaching and learning, of pedagogy.

The above-named panoply of theorists and theories implies an awful lot of “things” that interlocutors “do with words,” admittedly. Yet to all of these voices my work owes acknowledgement: these are the theoretical bases through which I seek to identify and understand *dialogue’s* constitutive elements, in practice. By committing to this broad yet robust amalgam of theoretical orientation, I hope to open, if guardedly, the generalizability of my coming analysis across different educational settings.

A Special Setting Needed, for Viewing a Special Phenomenon

I am studying the interaction of talk upon talk, of interlocutor upon interlocutor, in educational arenas with concomitant goals aimed at learning, at growth. I am *not*, by way of contrast, studying individuals who meet for problem solving or decision making, which are two other common contexts and purposes for people to meet in groups, perhaps to engage, expressly, in *dialogue*. In studying the discourse of, generally, “formalized

learning contexts,” I, of course, acknowledge that some patterns emerging in my analysis will owe to contextual variables specific to the setting being studied; indeed, I intend this study to highlight the very salience of *situation* upon *interaction*. However, to seek, practical indications and derive practical implications of such an ideal as is dialogue, one must look where the light shines at least adequately for such examination.

I return, then, to the call for dialogue in teaching and learning, from Alexander, perhaps the best-reputed pioneer and ongoing leader in the current pedagogical arena of chief concern to my proposed study. I borrow my study’s opening quotation from Alexander’s 2005 keynote address to the International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology. I judge that his viewpoint warrants this placement in my dissertation, because, in the view of many (e.g., Abbey, 2005; Bloom, et al., 2005; Myhill, 2006; Myhill, Jones, & Hopper, 2006; Vella, 2008), Alexander has led the way during the past decade toward advancing dialogic understandings in learning settings, while employing expressly discourse analytic methods—that is, by presenting and analyzing transcripts of recorded classroom interaction, toward the ongoing development of theories of “educational dialogue,” *per se*. Indeed, if there is an author with a special understanding of the movement underway, toward analyzing dialogic discourse in teaching and learning, Alexander is a worthy candidate for such designation.

In fact, Alexander has already released the fourth edition (2008) of his widely regarded (especially in the UK and northern Europe) *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*, making its fourth edition in just four years. From a methodological standpoint of discourse analysis (DA), Alexander and a few others, mostly in Great Britain, are, indeed, using DA methods to productively explore “dialogue

in the classroom,” as will be surveyed in the next chapter of this work. However, as scholars study transcribed discourse in search of “dialogue,” a lot depends upon the subjects and contexts: who is doing what dialogue-ing, and for what purpose? When I more fully canvas the available literature, wherein dialogue intersects with education, it will become clear that these available readings and relevant research primarily concern traditional teacher-education pedagogies and are thusly oriented to settings of K-12, with little applicability to a true sense of mutuality among teacher and learners, as might be sought in settings of adult learning, including college-level and beyond.

One reason for the present K-12 classroom focus, within dialogue research in pedagogy, is the relative lack of ongoing post-secondary professorial/pedagogical training of any kind (Loughran, 2006), for use as an alternative context for data gathering. College professors do not typically engage, systematically and necessarily, in ongoing in-service pedagogical training, unlike their K-12 counterparts (Berry, 2007). Schools of education (and, thus, literatures produced therein, including emergent dialogue theory, such as Alexander’s) are largely aimed at licensure for future K-12 teachers (Berry, 2007). Furthermore, in K-12 arenas, ongoing professional training (in-service participation) not only serves the promotion-track needs of the individual, it importantly serves to build community among teachers (Loughran, 2006). In contrast, college faculty rarely feel a strong institutional mandate, or even public pressure, to seek ongoing *pedagogical* training and development. The university professor is presumed pedagogically competent, problematic as this wide-sweeping assumption may be, so literatures of pedagogy are aimed at those presumed to need such literatures, such as teacher licensure candidates.

In contrast, the seeds of what I seek—the discursive anatomy of dialogue in teaching and learning—are not readily found, anywhere in K-12, owing not just to the presumed roles and rights of teacher versus student, but verily to role discrepancies between adult and child. Recall Alexander’s comment, quoted to open this dissertation, wherein he distinguishes between crucial needs of *learners* and unfulfilling performance norms by *teachers*. One might wonder, why does this teaching *norm* of unmet learner *needs* persist, despite the movement underway and decades of ongoing reform, at that? I would answer that the present educational dialogue research settings, by virtue of their marked chasm between the roles and identities of teacher and learner, make for dim locales for the observation of a genuine dialogue in practice. In contrast, a prospectively better place to look, for identifying the moves and processes of a dialogic education that privilege (and not seek to squash) difference, while striving for mutuality, indeed collegiality, would be a setting of *not* K-12 but of adult learning, including, perhaps, college level, but certainly that of professional development.

Yes, in *any* study of learning interaction, certain situationally-derived, and therefore context-specific, features within a discourse of teaching and learning would arise—seen in whatever degree of scrutiny is applied. The discursive interaction that unfolds in Ms. Green’s 3rd-grade remedial math group will differ in some important ways from what happens in Mr. Black’s 10th-grade biology lab, which will both align in some ways and deviate in others with the talk patterns that arise within Dr. Brown’s speech communication course at the university, and, for that matter, within debutante-formation sessions held at Madame Blanc’s Institute of Culture and Propriety. No two learning groups are ever exactly alike, including expected differences, small or large, in their

discursive practices and patterns (owing to differences in class, climate, culture, and purpose, among other factors). Importantly, such differences are not only expected between Brown's class and Black's; they are detected, by the close observer, between the talk unfolding in Green's 10 a.m. math class and that of her very next group coming in at 11!

No two classrooms are alike, nor can we study them all individually, but we can start somewhere, as regards looking for discursive patterns in educational settings that can inform normative theories of dialogue—of mutuality and authenticity in a setting of teaching and learning—toward improved *practice*, in both efficiency and effectiveness, not to mention in participant (both teacher and student) satisfaction and performance evaluation. Missing from the literature, as I will show, is productive study of *dialogue*, *per se*, in the context of college-level (or higher) learning, where the participants, whether young adults, older students, or faculty, bring a wider and richer array of life experience and intellectual breadth to the potential discussion/dialogue. I argue that this particular situation (faculty development) offers prospectively rich resources for the study of something (genuine dialogue) not so readily seen in other educational settings. I bring, therefore, to a well-lit setting for dialogic teaching and learning the theoretical underpinnings outlined above, toward goals of both context-specific understanding and larger prospective application.

In Search of Dialogue with a *Difference*

Along with demonstrating that this dissertation is not just viable, but, indeed, addresses a hot topic at the forefront of a significant pedagogical movement, I aim also to

show that the leading-edge perspectives, such as Alexander's, grounded as they are in educational psychology, could and should be sharpened by contributions available through an expressly communication-oriented lens. That is, along with the K-12 limitation just discussed, I see, within the present understanding of "dialogue in teaching and learning," an additional opening—in fact, a need—for a sturdier understanding of "*dialogue*," as grounded in phenomenological views with practical orientations, drawing from discourse studies and related communication theory.

Further, since I aim to help develop, through this project, what could over-archingly be considered "a communication ethic of pedagogy," I hope to provide value there by bringing into this literature of "dialogue in pedagogy" a dialogic study of *teachers*, discussing *teaching and learning*, to see what such a specialized discourse, when analyzed, can offer to both pedagogy and communication theory. This recursive move can be considered, methodologically, as similar to (if on a smaller scale, of course) the work of Cissna and Anderson (e.g., 2002), who in their work regarding dialogue, have focused sharply upon the momentous meeting of *dialogists* Carl Rogers and Martin Buber, convened in a public *dialogue* to discuss *dialogue*, itself. I expect to find illuminating differences in the dialogic practice of professors and other academics, as compared to teachers and students, K-12, as has dominated the educational dialogue literature.

Aided by communication-anchored understandings of dialogue theory as variously surveyed, propounded, and applied in Anderson, Baxter, and Cissna's (2004) landmark volume *Dialogue: Theorizing Difference in Communication Studies*, I here conclude that Anderson's pioneering educational psychology perspective has

simultaneously presented a vivid justification of this topic and also an *invitation* to develop it through a communication perspective, namely that which foregrounds and, in fact, cherishes *difference*.

Different From What?

Indeed, within the broad range of thought that comprises the unbounded intellectual terrain of dialogism, the *communicational* difference is *difference*. That is, communication theory enriches current conceptualizations of dialogue by foregrounding the idea that multiple voices cannot be “polyvocal” when they are saying the same thing, or too close to it. In the loosely quoted words of iconic pop singer, Tom Waits, if two people know the same thing, one of them is unnecessary. Or, as Per Linell (1998) makes the point, in *Approaching Dialogue*, “Indeed, if there were no asymmetries of knowledge between people, i.e. if everybody possessed the same information, there would be little point in communicating” (p. 14). That is, to count as *dialogue*, conversation requires some significant element of difference, whether in ideology or just perspective and informedness, perhaps a difference even experienced as conflict. But *what* must be different from *what*?

Speakers A and B can hardly be considered the *same* person. Even when two actors, while auditioning for a role, perform the exact same lines from a given script, one actor is chosen and the other not; their two renderings, of the identical text, are necessarily *different*. But if difference is the taproot in communication theory’s dialogue, there must be more to the concept than the shallow foil, presented tongue in cheek, by Mark Currie (2004) in the opening paragraph of his slim but complex treatise, *Difference*:

the New Critical Idiom (special accent on the “the” in the title): “What is more straightforward than the idea of difference? It is the opposite of sameness” (p. 1).

With the theoretical roots of this study grounded more in practical theory, than in continental philosophy (though the two cannot be completely separated—and are, in fact, often compatriots, as in Bourdieu (1990)—I shall not venture very far, in theorizing difference, into postmodernism, poststructuralism, postpositivism, nor post-anything-ism; nonetheless, I must own up to the inescapable influence of postmodernism (and its outgrowths) upon my, and any current social analyst’s, developing worldview, not to mention lived experience, as few would attempt to argue against the tenet that we are living in postmodern times.

I surely acknowledge that there is abundant important work being done in a postmodern register, as regards pedagogical theory, work parallel to, and sometimes informing of, my present work—though mine is, as I have stated, grounded more directly in theories of practice, guided by a first philosophy of ethics. Wide ranging postmodern ideas and developments have evolved, in pedagogical work, into important post-structuralist foundations of difference, such as Derrida’s *différance*, as is exploited, for example, throughout the edited volume, *Pedagogies of Difference* (Trifonas, 2003). Indeed, the poststructuralist view decries, as I do, the spectre of the transmission model as harmfully omnipresent in western pedagogy, such that “all knowing whose frame of reference is outside the epistémico-culturally determined ‘conditions of possibility’ for attaining and reproducing knowledge does not formally qualify as education or learning” (Trifonas, 2003, p. 221).

Likewise, Cummins (2003) writes to challenge the pedagogical assumptions and processes that develop under the social “construction of difference as deficit” (p. 41), with his eye on the intersection of linguistic diversity in education and societal power relations. These are but two examples of recent thinking, where *difference* is explored in educational contexts using a postmodern lens, a strain of thinking that runs, if not parallel to my practical-theory analysis, then perhaps more as a helix, separate strands coming forth from, then headed back into, the same general direction, periodically crossing paths, if not touching.

For example, Currie (2004) provides a thorough and rich account of the concept of difference, as a linguistic (a short step from discursive) product necessary to the very function of language. Currie builds his formulation largely upon semiotic foundations in Saussure’s *Course in Linguistics*: “It is not then that Saussure’s concept of difference is the source of all of relational identity thinking, but that it is a wonderfully clear account of what relational identity means” (p. 8). Relational identity is the core of difference theory, for Currie, working from Saussure, to offer that, “in language, there are only differences, and no positive terms” (p. 21). That is, there is no extralinguistic reality to guarantee the meaning of words: everything is different from everything, through language. There is no given anything, no starting point.

It is important to note that Currie (2004) takes great pains (citing such philosophers as Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Husserl, and Heidegger) to show that this conceptualization of difference has many philosophical roots, roots that run parallel to the roots of difference in Saussure’s linguistic-structuralist account, although he likewise admits that “Anglo-American literary studies,” especially (in contrast to

French, German, and other continental thought), has “every reason to see difference as a Saussurean and as a structuralist invention” (p.6). A lot of the discrepancy has to do with the timings of translations and the popularization of ideas, such as Saussure’s, several decades after he wrote. Further, when we moderate Saussure’s relativism with the concerns of Deleuze (1977/1994), concern that *difference* be trivialized into mere *opposition* (a given something defined by and against its mere opposite,) we are compelled to see meaning and language, itself, as not only Deleuze’s very container for difference, but as an endless array of semiotic possibility. To the question, then, “Different from what?” I propose to distill from the above materials my answer: “different, through the centrifugal force of dialogue, *from everything else*—and yet to everything else, owing.

From Theories of *Difference* to Theories of *Practice*

To clarify, my theoretical orientation is grounded not in the interests of deconstructing textual subjects in a postmodern frame, as others (e.g., Peters, 2003), several of whom, gathered together in Trifonas (2003), are doing in productive explorations of difference/*différance* in education), but in phenomenological understandings and ethics and also in theories of *practice* that regard both education and communication, as Wenger (1998) articulates in *Communities of Practice*. For now, in this introduction, suffice to say that communities of practice develop over time, through the performance of meaningful activity by people, activities felt as shared (with conscious or unconscious motivations, as Bourdieu, 1990, points out). For example, an obvious example of an *activity* experienced as shared (if not consciously thought of as a

practice) would be the ritualized performances of devotees of a sports team (not to mention of the team, itself!) gathered in a stadium. As such, practice (say, cheering, informedly, of the team, league, and sport) becomes the basis for community, itself, and *learning* becomes a main and necessary trunk upward, as participation and reflection create shared repertoires and communities of practice, themselves, “can be thought of as shared histories of learning” (Wenger, 1988, p. 88).

Closer to home, for present purposes, if yet on foreign soil, is the “ed-psych” turf of educational dialogue. This perspective is simplistically oriented toward the achievement of knowledge transference, and that is exactly the problem, in the eyes of Trifonas and other post-structuralists inspired by Derrida. By any accounting, the traditional and still-standing über-goal of teaching, in terms of conventional and current pedagogy, is student mastery (or at least improved understanding) of the *preordained* lesson-of-the-day. I am reminded by the poststructuralist critique, but not reliant upon it, since the ed-psych perspective, itself, as well as other mainstream pedagogies, such as Alexander’s (2005; 2008), make room for critique, closer-to-home, internally (ed-psych critiquing ed-psych) in terms of pragmatic difficulties and dilemmas. As a thread connecting “ed psych” to “comm theory,” tensions and dilemmas, themselves, serve as a central elements in Craig and Tracy’s (e.g., 1995) expressly *practical* perspective on communication theory. In educational dialogue, these dilemmas and difficulties arise, I argue, at least in part from undertheorized understandings of dialogue itself, a problem I hope to ameliorate via this study.

One recent and ongoing trend in such mainstream, if not postmodern, criticism exposes the risks of defining learning via the measurement of the prescribed/preordained

learning outcomes (Gredler & Shields, 2008), especially through standardized testing. Indeed, it is only fair to recognize that the widespread and increasingly popular “constructivist” movement in education has compelled the development of pedagogical epistemologies (Cazden, 2001; Mayo, 1999; Russell & Loughran, 2007; Tobias & Duffy, 2009), building upon ideas such as the “construction of knowledge.” Yet the traditional frame persists: what is truly sought—hence serving as the foundation and title of Mercer’s (1995) oft-cited book toward this epistemology—is the *guided* construction of knowledge. Thusly, what is yet sought is discursive convergence, not divergence. Viva la *différance*? Hardly.

Dialogue in Teaching: Preferred Mode of Communication and Instruction?

Before closing this introduction to my study, one last issue—raised frequently by helpful critics and collaborators—must be addressed. Am I arguing, in the main, that dialogue is the preferred—the best—mode of communication within settings of teaching and learning? Surely, I am not. The counterpart to constructivist instruction, often known as direct instruction, has both its stalwart advocates and, clearly, its preferred time and place. As Stanford University researchers, Schwartz, Lindgen, and Lewis (2009) write, in their essay, “Constructivism in an Age of Non-constructivist Assessments,” which is presented among 18 variously couched essays brought together by editors Tobias and Duffy (2009) in *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?*, “Direct instruction can be very effective, assuming that people have sufficient prior knowledge to construct new knowledge from what they are being told or shown (p. 39). This, of course, is a

constructivist perspective, in that it qualifies the uses of direct instruction in constructivist terms.

Constructivist critics, such as Sweller (2009), point out the constructivists often insulate themselves from critique in this very way, alleging that “techniques that could in principle prove negative for constructivist teaching seem to have been ruled out [by constructivists] as illegitimate” (p.27). Tobias (2009) agrees that “Constructivists have their own myopic view, seemingly adverse to talking about mechanisms, in particular, information processing mechanisms, that may underlie the effectiveness of guidance or scaffolding” (p. 352). Further, Tobias judges the debate between constructivists and advocates of direct instruction as hampered when members of two camps too frequently indulge in “talking past each other in the design and interpretation of the research and in what they consider to be evidence” (p. 353).

Further yet, before one might presume that constructivist education is generally superior and should be the norm in teaching, the complication proposed by Klahr (2009) must be acknowledged, that constructivist approaches require greater levels of both teacher knowledge and teaching skill. Tobias (2009) concedes the salience of this point, noting that “Any instructional method requiring abilities that occur infrequently in the population is bound to be ineffective when applied generally in situations where individuals cannot be selected for that ability” (p. 345). Whereas Herman and Gomez (2009) propose that such problematic deficits in constructivist teaching methodology (also known as “discovery” approaches), or even in deficits in subject-matter expertise can be mitigated through professional development, that is, though in-service teacher training (the very context and site of this dissertation research), Tobias (2009) yet

maintains that “It remains to be seen whether any such development activities succeed in turning the majority of individuals with average teaching abilities into superior teachers” (p. 345). I would conclude that there are multiple uses—and views—regarding both constructivist and direct instruction approaches, by agreeing with Jonassen (2009): “There is no holy Grail, no single theory or research method that is able to explicate learning rather than asserting a theoretical or methodological superiority. We should collaboratively address the unsolved mysteries of learning” (p. 28).

Structural Plan of the Dissertation

Following this introductory chapter, in which I define my area of interest, ground my theoretical and analytic frame, and argue for legitimacy and significance, this dissertation will unfold as follows:

In Chapter 2: Review of the Literature, I bring in and interweave the essential strands of research and theory available in literatures associated with the construct I seek to identify and design, that of *dialogue in teaching and learning*. Toward this end, I first look at existing understandings, within pedagogical literatures, of dialogue in educational settings. Since so closely related, I will also look at prevalent ideas regarding *discussion*, without the emphasis on dialogue, as a process and product in educational discourses and settings. Following this look at the predominant pedagogical literature, Chapter 2 surveys the literatures foundational to understandings of dialogue within *communication* contexts, toward establishing a firm platform of communication theory upon which to move forward in defining, with communication-studies sensitivities, the proposed anatomy of dialogue in teaching and learning. Chapter 2 concludes with my research question,

concerning the constitutive elements, inherent dilemmas, and prospective improvements regarding the practice of dialogue in teaching and learning.

In Chapter 3, Research Setting and Event: Discursive Arena for Analysis, I articulate in greater detail the contextual framework of the research, since qualitative research—such as this study—requires an equally robust familiarity with the interpretive frame of the participants (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Specifically, I present in Chapter 3 detailed description regarding the physical site and, within that, the more interpretive *scene*. I further present relevant background information and analytic resources regarding the training course, itself, with due emphasis upon my special connection to this event, which began two months before it took place. I also trace the marked evolution of my role during the 12-weeks of the program’s unfolding, in the first year, of two, wherein I participated and recorded the sessions, as researcher. Lastly, I present a look at the participants, in terms of their institutional identities and roles in the training workshop.

In Chapter 4, Methodology, I present and substantiate the methods by which I strive to find answers to my research question. This chapter begins with an overview of key definitions and analytic assumptions. I next present the open-ended analytic scheme for analyzing talk as dialogue, *per se*, building upon my prior analytic and methodological work (Craig & Zizzi, 2007; Zizzi, 2008a, 2008b) toward a pragmatic dialogic analysis. I next present a review of related methodologies used in prior studies of the discourse in teaching and learning settings and then move to qualify my setting as especially rich for the investigation of dialogue in teaching and learning, in that it circumvents a prevalent dilemma in traditional settings of teaching and learning. I next present a rationale for a twin-tiered dialogic analysis: first, examining the dialogic

situation, then considering dialogic interaction. Following this rationale, I present my metatheoretic and analytic stance, followed by my methods of data collection, transcription, and my system for the selection of special data segments for close examination. I conclude the section with a discussion of human subject protection.

With literature reviewed, research question presented, scene set, and methods established, the study moves into the first of two distinct chapters of data analysis, starting with Chapter 5, Data Analysis, Part I: Exploring the *Dialogic* (or Not) *Situation*, which presents dialogic analysis at the situational level. Here I closely examine carefully chosen event-definitional episodes, which I will present and analyze as constitutive of the “dialogic situation,” that is, of the dynamic, dialogic character of the training event, itself. Since I am approaching, through this study and in its special setting, a definitional anatomy of dialogue, as seen through the lens of practical communication theory, a view centered upon Buberian ideals of mutuality, authenticity, and openness—toward *difference*, productively *engaged*—I will especially seek, in Chapter 5, to locate and analyze evidence to help identify key challenges and difficulties experienced by the participants, toward those Buberian ideals. Through analysis of difficult moments of session discourse, aided significantly by interviewing data, I tease out interactional challenges and identify strategies for managing them, toward the facilitation of faculty training with dialogic strength. Broadly, this situational level regards the overarching question of contextual fertility or as, Austin (1962) might have said, of the *felicity* in this dialogic situation: *Can we talk?*

From the situational focus of Chapter 5, I move, in Chapter 6, Data Analysis, Part II: Dialogue in Teaching and Learning—Anatomy of a Process: Three Stages at Three

Temperatures. In this chapter, I move to the *interactional* level of dialogic analysis, examining selected segments of recorded interaction for their dialogic character and content. In scrutinizing these selected exchanges, I strive to further clarify and develop my analytic model—known to this point as “the pragmatics of dialogue”—in terms that further illuminate the discursive moves that serve to productively manage, in practice, the previously identified dilemmas faced by participants within this context of faculty development. If the central question at the situational level of dialogue concerns felicitous conditions—*Can we talk?*—the central question at the micro level of dialogue concerns dialogic pragmatics: *How can we talk, together?*

I conclude the dissertation with Chapter 7: Summary and Conclusions. In this chapter, I summarize my findings and propose practical applications, while also acknowledging the limitations of this study. Also, I offer my thoughts regarding directions for future research and present my final thoughts. All in all, this concluding chapter is intended to highlight the practical applications earlier shown, toward moving past the identified challenges to *dialogue in teaching and learning*, not just in the faculty training context, but more generally in any discussion aimed and intended to open and invigorate processes of discursive engagement, toward outcomes of learning.

Summary of my Rationale and Intent

Begun by Socrates, energized by Dewey, informed by Vygotsky and Piaget, liberated by Freire, and now championed by Alexander and many others to be next surveyed, a “movement” is underway in education. This movement aims to improve dialogue in education, since, improving our understanding of how we talk, together, holds

rich promise as a resource for increasing empowerment and freedom in education. But the movement is in need of a communication-based reinforcement of the troops, as well as some new, grown-up territory to master. Through this study, I aim to aid and abet this movement, by using methods of ethnographically informed, “dialogic” discourse analysis to develop an expressly practical understanding of dialogue in teaching and learning, particularly in the present setting of faculty-development.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: REGARDING “DIALOGUE” IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS AND RESERCH AND IN CONTEXTS OF COMMUNICATION THEORY

Defining “Dialogue in Teaching and Learning”

To move now into the review of relevant literatures, it is important to begin with an acknowledgment that the very nature of this dissertation centers upon terms, that, themselves, are defined in many varying ways—some quite distinct, some similar or at least complementary, and others that flat-out contradict one another. The variability among case-relevant concepts and definitions, as regards both *dialogue* and its subspecies of interest, *dialogue in teaching and learning*, requires, prior to “reviewing the literature,” a preliminary answer to a foundational question: “which literature to review?” Indeed this is a matter of selection, and the selection itself implies choices of epistemology (how we *know*), ontology (who and how we *are*), and even axiology (what we *value*). This I grant. As with the master term, *dialogue*, itself, there is no single definition of an expressly educational *dialogue*; hence there is no single “literature” for preliminary, foundational survey. Steered by the theoretical foundations espoused and methodological work to follow, choices must be made.

Which Literature to Survey?

This general point, about the relevance of multiple literatures, could be argued, I imagine, before the review of the literature of any major study that necessarily rests upon a firm and demonstrated platform of comprehensiveness. The greater the familiarity with the scholar’s subject matter, the more the scholar is apt to understand (and acknowledge)

the many faces, uses, and interpretations of terminologies (consider Burke's, 1945, "terministic screens") that are available and even central to the work at hand. Especially, within the purview of the practical and multifaceted discipline of communication (Craig, 1999), wherein this present project not only resides, but from whence it emanates, one should expect this acknowledgment—so made.

What follows then, will I hope reveal a serviceably coherent blending of voices, with significant underpinnings showing, toward a working and reasonable definition of "dialogue in teaching and learning," by invoking existing scholarship, terms and concepts within literatures of pedagogy and communication. Many pedagogical writers use the term *classroom dialogue*; however, few do so with theoretical depth. I wish to enrich, through analysis of my abundant and well specialized data, how we understand this core concept so as to foreground the *communicational* aspects, to then inform the *pedagogical*.

In brief, the following review of relevant literatures will begin with considerations of current understandings of discourse, itself, in pedagogy, including an over-reliance upon the dated transmission model of communication as well as of teaching and learning. Following that discussion of discourse in pedagogy, I will move to current understandings of *dialogue* in educational contexts, exploring the theoretical roots of educational dialogue, from Socrates forward, also moving from the prominent K-12 literature into the lesser-developed adult-ed literature. Next I will examine relevant issues of power and will identify a resulting "power-full" dilemma of chief significance in formalized educational settings, as prevails over discourse therein. Then I will review a number of recent and relevant discourse-analytic studies in pedagogy, for mining concepts and techniques for this dissertation, and this mining will lead into a revelation of

the salience of “the situation” as a foundational component of educational dialogue, a component that, for productive understanding, requires the importation of conceptualizations of dialogue stemming not from pedagogical literature, but from communication theory. This will lead to an interrogation of the very nature of dialogue in teaching and learning, and that interrogation will lead to the presentation of my research question.

Overview of the Current Pedagogical Perspective on Educational Dialogue

I begin this review by presenting a snapshot of the current understanding of classroom dialogue within the literature of pedagogy. To do, so, I present a recent and prominent foundational passage from Alexander (2005), who, along with another chief proponent, Nicholas Burbules (1993) uses the term *classroom dialogue*—the closest existing term to the construct I am after in pedagogical literature, especially in the literature of educational psychology. In this passage, Alexander aims to characterize, by contrasting *dialogue* to *conversation*, the heart of classroom dialogue, which he brought, first in 2004, into the spotlight through his groundbreaking and well-celebrated monograph, *Dialogic Teaching*. In his soon-following keynote address, made to the International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology, Alexander (2005) presents this definitional distinction:

Conversation and dialogue: So the critical questions here concern not so much the tone of the discourse as its meaning and where it leads. I want to suggest a stipulative distinction, for the classroom context, between “conversation” and “dialogue,” which is necessary because most dictionaries treat the two as

synonymous. Where the end point of conversation may not be clear at the outset, in classroom dialogue, for the teacher at least, it usually is. (p. 8)

The pedagogical stance is surely not well aligned to the dialogue-as-communication view of, say, Leslie Baxter (e.g., Baxter, 2004; Baxter, 2006; Baxter & Montgomery, 1996). To Baxter, Montgomery, and others interested in dialogic communication studies, the “endpoint” of dialogue would scarcely be desired as “clear at the outset.” And yet both Alexander and Baxter purport explicitly to draw from the same theoretical foundation, namely the dialogism of Mikhail Bakhtin. To wit, shortly following this passage in Alexander’s (2005) speech, he confesses, “This, I admit, is an overtly Bakhtinian version of dialogue” (p. 8). The communication scholar knows well that Baxter’s Bakhtin would have little interest in considering an endpoint “clear at the outset”—because, in fact, there is no “endpoint” to dialogue, ever, in the Bakhtinian view (1981; 1986), as understood by scholars oriented toward dialectic and difference, as is Baxter, famously, along with others in the growing Bakhtinian camp, such as Holt (2003). And lest one wonder whether I am misunderstanding Alexander (or quoting him out of context), I would add yet another revealing passage. In the following, Alexander has called for a teacher’s “repertoire” of five communication styles, the fifth and final of which (and the one of central concern in his work and in this address) being “*Dialogue*: achieving common understanding through structured, cumulative questioning and discussion which guide and prompt, reduce choices, minimise risk and error, and expedite the ‘handover’ of concepts and principles” (2005, p.12).

That is educational psychology speaking through the mouth of its number one spokesperson, at present, as regards dialogue in teaching and learning, which, for

Alexander, narrows to *classroom dialogue*, the term that, I remind, currently serves the literature as the closest available term for the educational discourse I seek to identify and explore.

In marked contrast to Alexander's definition of "classroom dialogue," communicational understandings of dialogue seek neither to "reduce choices" (much to the contrary, the goal is to open choices: Bakhtin's centrifugal, not centripetal, effect) nor to "expedite the 'handover' of concepts and principles." Educational scholarship may comprise the most active arena, right now, for fine-grained, discourse-analytic study of "dialogic" talk in formal educational settings, but it is communication theory wherein dialogue, itself, is being worked productively toward the ideals, held in varying degrees by both literatures, of both diversity and difference, toward transformative and authentic outcomes. As Deetz proposed in 1992 and still insists, including with Simpson, in 2004, "We reserve the concept *dialogue* to designate the productive (rather than reproductive) communication processes enabling these radical transformations. We believe that this process is what pulls together the great communication theories of dialogue" (Deetz & Simpson, 2004, p. 144). So the definition, in this present, communication-centered, study of dialogue in teaching and learning, must emerge against this firmer-established, in pedagogical literature, understanding of dialogue as a multi-party process toward a pre-set end.

I have, an opening with Alexander, made a beeline to the head of the class to assert and demonstrate the solvency of my claim that pedagogical understandings my central term differ markedly from the communicational understanding I wish to develop in this study. I have thereby at least established that the closest present conceptualization,

of what I am after (*dialogue in teaching and learning*), in its most mainstream and prominent current usage (i.e. *classroom dialogue*), in pedagogical literature, yet misses the communicational orientation to difference, to meaning co-constituted through social interaction, to openness and production, not closure and reproduction, in both content and relational dimensions of performed talk in educational settings. Lacking the broader construct (as my proposed term would encompass), I shall now explore foundational conceptualizations of “classroom discourse,” beginning with a clarification of present understandings of the term, understandings that indeed arise in pedagogical contexts. Therefore, I shall next review selected literatures, to open the possibilities for tracking, through the wide-ranging and practical discipline of communication (Craig, 1999), the proposed construct of a special and especially productive form of talk in teaching and learning.

Dominant Conceptualization of “Classroom Discourse” in Present Educational Literature:

Transmission Due for an Overhaul

The above-presented and up-to-date line of “dialogue in the classroom” traces back to certain traditional ideas of communication in education, as I will next review. First, I would note that Alexander’s work, which opened this essay, prominently and often cites Courtney Cazden’s foundational book *Classroom Discourse, the Language of Teaching and Learning* (1988/2001). Cazden’s analysis of classroom discourse arises, as does Alexander’s, from the Ed. School (this time not Cambridge, but Harvard), and her book has long served as a cornerstone for scholarship oriented to the discursive and communicative centers of classroom interaction. Clearly, though, it bespeaks a mechanistic understanding of communication, with much emphasis on teacher control,

including the control of turn taking, preferable timing (duration) of student input, and the monitoring of student speech styles. I would note that Cazden's classroom-discourse influence, though most notable in the past twenty years, took root well before her 1988 landmark, including the publication of *Functions of Language in the Classroom*, a major compendium she co-edited with Dell Hymes in 1972. I point this out as a dialogic disclaimer of sorts, since, as we know from Bakhtin, any presumed starting points or turning points within the literature are, themselves, parts of other presumable starting points and turning points.

Nonetheless, Cazden's work, beginning with the collaboration with Hymes and extending into the present, serves well to characterize the foundation of the larger, prevailing communicational perspective on "classroom discourse," a mainstream perspective that is also informed broadly, though differently, by Vygotsky (1986), who emphasizes learning as social process, and is still inspired by Freire (1970; 1986) regarding teaching as liberatory. Cazden's voice is hardly alone, but it does tend to find privilege in education literatures with expressly discursive interests, such as Bloome's (2005) *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Literary Events*, which cites both the first edition (1988) of Cazden's *Classroom Discourse* and her 1972 volume with Hymes. In fact it is quite common (e.g., Ellsworth, 1997; Manke, 1997; Cooper & Simonds, 1999; Myhill, Jones, & Hopper, 2006) to find Cazden cited as foundational, and to some, she represents a starting point, indeed, as regards classroom discourse.

Clearly, then, a stalwart in the educational-discourse literature, Cazden nonetheless uses an approach, like Alexander's, that is grounded in mechanistic, linear views of communication. She assumes the lay understanding of communication (rooted

in Shannon and Weaver's Source-Message-Channel-Receiver) that Craig (1999) characterizes as falling in the "cybernetic" orientation, more specifically, as a "transmission" orientation to communication. Sender "has" a message—an enormous conceptual problem for Deetz (e.g., 1990; 1992; 2006) and many others, right at the start—and then transmits the message to Receiver. In other sources (e.g., Locher, 2004), the players, in communication are Speaker and Hearer. Upon this sturdy bedrock of communicational oversimplification, Cazden writes with authority of the duties and productive prospects of the teacher who successfully manages turn taking and other manifestations of "speaking rights and listening responsibilities" (2001, p. 82). Notice, there, the customary separation of speaking and listening, this separation the hallmark of the transmission model. And it is right here in Cazden, whose work has been so central in defining the space where the literatures of pedagogy and discourse theory overlap (Cole & Zuengler, 2008).

Note that I cite Cazden's seldom-referenced second edition (2001) of *Classroom Discourse*, which I stumbled upon, much by chance, unaware that an updated edition even existed, since it is consistently her first edition, from 1988, that is very often cited in the literature, even in recent works, such as Cole and Zuengler's (2008) *The Research Process and Classroom Discourse Analysis: Current Perspectives* and also Henning's (2008) *The Art of Discussion-Based Teaching*. So armed, I would point out that even the updated edition of Cazden's classroom-discourse breakthrough yet regards the participants of teaching and learning through the transmission lens. This fundamental view did not change as communication theory did; no wonder her 1988 edition is still cited in recent pedagogical scholarship. This fact suggests that those interested today in

both pedagogy and communication, being as such discursively oriented, are likely influenced by Cazden's perspective and emphasis, couched and promoted as it is under the simple aegis of turn taking and turn duration. This aegis overarches the foundational, taken-for-granted, "transmission" of knowledge through alternating roles among communicators—that is, the alternating roles of speakers and listeners, and by extension, of teachers and learners. Cazden does appeal for an idealized "deregulation" of classroom discourse, yet it remains the teacher who must conscientiously "direct verbal traffic" (p. 82), even to the extent of, in one specific example she provides, the teacher directing the too-frequent contributor "to not speak at all for twenty minutes" (p. 84). I am not critiquing the method, just showing it as not centrally connected to, say, critical perspectives on power, and it is, indeed, rooted in the linear, transmission model of communication, which perpetuates in pedagogical literatures, especially those outside of communication or discourse literatures (even as regards constructivist education (Duffy & Jonassen, 1992)).

As should be expected, there are many voices, many of whom indeed cite Cazden, that populate the mainstream communication-within-education literature. As she is a leader, there are many followers. A ready example is found in the teacher-ed textbook, *Communication for the Classroom Teacher* (Cooper & Simonds, 1999). Here we find no mention at all of "dialogue" (the term even absent in the index), though there is a chapter on "Leading Classroom Discussions." This chapter includes less than one page on "the role of the student," who is presumed a very minor player in the management of classroom discussion. We again see evidence of the teacher-as-discursive-traffic-cop orientation foundational in Cazden, though she does desire to improve the cop. Two sets

of bullet points comprise this brief section on student roles in Cooper and Simonds (1999), one set borrowed from Deemer (1986), and one set from Tiberius (1990). For example, from Deemer, one such student commitment is to “try to understand all sides of the issue” (1999, p. 166). Likewise, from Tiberius comes the rule that the student shall “speak whenever you wish (if you are not interrupting someone else, of course), even though your idea may seem incomplete,” though separately admonishing that the student shall “stick to the subject and talk briefly” (p. 167).

In all authors cited above—to represent the general communication-in-education philosophy of opening, not closing, of discussion—the practical understanding, the pragmatics, remain stuck in a transmission-model of communication, bereft of constitutive understandings of communication and dialogic possibilities in the co-making of meaning and even identity. I seek not Cazden’s orderly and more inclusive flow of traffic; rather, what I seek is closer to Bakhtin’s (1984a) *carnival* (also *carnivalesque*). Most of all, I seek pedagogical development that transcends what is possible atop understandings of communication limited by the understandably-prevalent (basic) transmission model of communication.

Existing Critiques of the Transmission Model in Pedagogical Contexts

The transmission model is running, but it is noticeably slipping gears, making strange noises, and, in the diagnostic view of some (e.g., Sotto, 1994), much in need an overhaul. Better to do it now, while the vehicle (of, say, public education) is still on the road—if encumbered by over-testing and back-to-basics regressions that reach too far back—than at the presumable break-down point, where any usable parts grind into waste and the towing required (legislation) brings its own added risks of exacerbating the

damage, as many critics, such as Garrison and Archer (2000) note is now happening under the mandates of “accountability” through standardized testing.

Indeed, if there were a recent pedagogical book best aimed explicitly at fixing this very problem (the simplistic transmission-model orientation to discourse in education) it might be Garrison and Archer’s (2000) *A Transactional Perspective on Teaching and Learning: A Framework for Adult and Higher Education*. Alas, where Garrison and Archer join me, expressly, in my critique of transmission model within educational contexts and theory, these authors lack the discursive depth needed to make the *dialogic* fix, to the satisfaction of discourse theory of any complexity. Again, the word “dialogue” is absent from the book’s index. Instead, Garrison and Archer contrast the transmission, or linear, model of communication against what they propose as a “transactional” model of teaching-learning. That appears promising, and their work will reappear in this study, aiding my analysis at the situational level (Chapter 5). In the main, however, their model is rooted in the constructivist idea of learning by *doing*. Were they to invoke Austin’s (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*, we would be more on the same page, so to speak, or at least in the same shelf of the library, that of discourse theory.

It is helpful that Garrison and Archer(2000) cite Habermas—in particular, his ideas of communication competence and also his ideal speech situation, which they convert into their own “ideal learning situation” (p. 4), which, for example, shifts the transmission model’s *control* for their transactional model’s *responsibility*. Moreover, their focus on *adult* learning adds further utility to the present study, given my research site and context in faculty development, not K-12 pedagogy. However, the hero of their model emerges as not Habermas, but Dewey; as regards interaction: their primary telos is

not toward dialogue, learning by talking together; rather it is of collaboration, learning by doing together. Thereby, they propose that their model serves to illuminate their book's central "consideration of two processes which are essential for the achievement of the goals of education, particularly higher education—critical thinking (CT) and self-directed learning (SDL)" (2000, p. 4).

To cement this subtle, but important, distinction of this close cousin of my own intentions, I would point out that Garrison and Archer (2000), even while invoking Carl Rogers (as champion of "personal dignity and demonstrating trust in the individual to grow responsibly" (p. 24), propose on the same page that "the aim of learning is to discover meaning through experience—not simply to assimilate information." Likewise, Sotto (1994) directly critiques the transmission model of communication, by that name, in his book *When Teaching Becomes Learning*. However, in only one three-sentence paragraph, across the whole work, is the idea of *dialogue* ever broached (by name, anyway), and even there the term dialogue is presented with a warning: "Learning is, to a considerable extent, a matter of having to discard first assumptions and grope for new ones. That can make learning and teaching quite an anxiety-provoking business" (p. 162).

Yes, these authors are in the correct aisle of the library, as it regards education reform in terms of illuminating the obsolescence of transmission model assumed by Cazden et al., but they fail to approach the fix in expressly discursive terms and dialogic sensitivities, even while citing Carl Rogers, as do Garrison and Archer (2000) in terms of openness to change. I conclude that educators, aided by, perhaps led by, communication theorists, must repair this noisy and rough-running misunderstanding, else we will be left

with a diagnosis but no basis for repair, like a mechanic trying to replace the clutch on a 5-speed, using a repair manual for an automatic transmission.

In sum, to soundly support the diagnosis and suggest its repair, I have foregrounded Cazden's foundational and much cited transmission view of classroom discourse, naming also a smattering of her advocates, because hers has guided the mainstream teacher-ed literature since 1988 and earlier. Of course, many lesser-known players have operated on the same assumption, such as Hills (1986), who, in grounding his book, *Teaching, Learning and Communication*, goes as far as mapping out the transmission model (citing Shannon & Weaver!), in the foundational chapter, "Education as a Communication Process." Further, I have worked to show that the trend persists, in the K-12 pedagogical arena, right up to Alexander's prominent contributions presently, which expressly name dialogue as the ideal. Indeed, little substantive change is happening as regards the foundational and representative understandings of classroom discourse. Prevalent views, even those aspiring to *pedagogical dialogue*, remain flawed by their transmission-model underpinnings and the concomitant oversimplification regarding definitions, practices, and the very potential of a truly productive, perhaps transformational, *communicational dialogue*, one courting difference and even conflict and one thereby rich in interactional and epistemological implications and defining characteristics. Where we find dialogue, expressly, as an ideal within education, we see it defined, simply, whether expressed or implied, as "multiple voices heard" in (or even out of) the classroom, especially in pedagogical literature, which, in the main, arises from schools of education that are chiefly concerned with teacher-training, K-12, as I

emphasized in Chapter 1. That, of course, is not the only literature, as regards educational communication, but it is the most traditional literature and also the most dominant.

Issues of Power: An Often Overlooked Undercurrent

The idea of teacher as speaking and listening “traffic cop,” who thoughtfully exercises the inherent legitimate power to invite or close off voices, invites a sophisticated discussion of *power*, yet this topic is but an asterisk in most mainstream pedagogical literatures oriented to the talk in the classroom. Today’s call, as regards power in classroom discourse, remains primarily a call for a more thoughtful deployment of the teacher’s institutional asymmetry as holder of power over control of the right to speak.

More prevalent understandings of power, fueled by Foucault (cf. 1980; 1982/1984) and the thousands who cite him, are prominent in much of social theory, including educational theory not aimed expressly at discourse. One prominent example is the work of Mary Manke (1997), whose influential book, *Classroom Power Relations*, does bring in some expressly discourse-based understandings, for example citing Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory and then providing practical strategies for their use. For example, she employs a whole chapter to show how the “indirect speech act,” functions “to avoid threatening the ‘face’ or personal dignity of other participants” (1997, p. 76) as seen in the extended discussion involving her main exemplar: the reformulation of “Sit down Sally!” into “Sally would you like to sit down?” Indeed, this appears an example that would pertain only to the teaching of young children; however, such issues of face-preservation, and the need for preventing face-threatening acts (FTAs), as Brown and Levinson (1987), have articulated in detail, are scarcely restricted to expressly

pedagogical contexts. Indeed, face concerns apply to adult learning as well, as will surface in the analysis chapters of this study, including even reference to the very situation faced by Manke's exemplifying teacher. We shall soon see the director of the project at the site of my research making the very same request, if not worded quite so delicately, to a tenured faculty member who has arisen from his seat, attempting to depart the scene as the action becomes conflictual though the clock not quite yet pointing to the time to leave.

Manke's perspective is a start, as regards understanding both classroom power and discursive performance and performativity within. Alas, Manke's perspective has not been well advanced in pedagogical literature, in the way that I propose dialogue theory can advance it, including through heightened understandings of power *relations*, as promoted in Foucault (1984/1994) and as now flourishes abundantly within communication and discourse theory, critical theory (as in the critical discourse analysis, CDA, of say Fairclough (1999/2006) and Van Dijk (1992/2006)). That is, the more current sense of power in communication theory moves power from unilateral and stifling to dialectical and prospectively productive, though its *product* is not necessarily intended or even desirable by all (or any) parties involved. As Butler (1997) explains, building her own definitions upon Foucault, "by 'productive' I do not mean positive or beneficial, but rather a view of power as formative and constitutive, that is, not conceived exclusively as an external exertion of control or as the deprivation of liberties" (p. 132).

Another theme within pedagogical literature in which power takes a front seat is the idea of "ownership" in learning. For example, Canadian researchers (and former K-12 educators) Curt Dudley-Marling and Dennis Searle (1995) have edited a volume directly

aimed at exploring the question, “*Who owns Learning?*” Subtitled, *Questions of Autonomy, Choice and Control*, their volume presents a series of essays intended to probe the underlying assumptions under such concepts as constructivist education. These questions are explored at both micro and macro levels of “power in educational settings.” For example at the micro level, Ames and Gahagan (1995) present possibilities, couched in the idea of “reflective evaluation” (p. 53), in which students act as their own critics. In other words, students’ own evaluation of their work (in this case of their reading) is seen as crucial, and when properly managed, empowering (1995). One cannot, however, miss the prospect that the necessary, according to Ames and Gahagan, “management” of this evaluation remains a mechanism of control held by the teacher; in fact, it is a mechanism of control very systematically employed toward the “scaffolding” of one pre-established concept upon another. This is a participative ideal, indeed, but it falls short in its ideology of the goals of dialogue, of producing new understandings through the open and robust engagement of difference. Such mainstream and well intentioned pedagogies as this, which purport to level the playing field where teacher and learner engage, do not go deeply enough to truly open the dynamics of power relations.

Furthermore, it is more at the institutional (not interactional) level that this question, “Who Owns Learning?” is explored across the Dudley-Marling and Searle (1995) volume. For example, in an essay by Margaret Stevenson, “The Power of Influence: Effecting Change by Developing Ownership,” the focus is on “helping schools develop their programs” (p. 135) through the use of inter-school and inter-district networking and the use of external consultants. Hence the book’s exploration of “questions of autonomy choice and control” is aimed more at a school having its own

choices (institutional level) than of learners in the classroom gaining autonomy over their learning and learning processes (interactional level). This is hardly a surprise, given that pedagogical materials are generally aimed at K-12 contexts, where it is presumed that, during conversational engagement, “teacher knows best.” With this K-12 orientation prevalent in pedagogical literatures, including those focused upon power, it is reasonable to expect that more subtle and sophisticated explorations of “autonomy choice and control,” especially as regards the discourse (particularly dialogue) in teaching and learning may more clearly arise in literatures (and settings) of adult education, where issues of learner autonomy and related matters, such as the validity and the importance of prior knowledge, are allowed and even presumed (Knowles, 1990) as compelling facets of the teaching and learning that transpires therein.

Therefore, such are the very themes (as regards power and autonomy) that I shall take up more directly and in depth in my analysis, where my data is indeed that of strictly adult interaction. At that time, I shall invoke the provocative stance of self-described postmodernist Elizabeth Ellsworth (1997), who borrows from terminologies of film (and other media) studies the potent idea of “address.” Her work, *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy and the Power of Address*” seeks to “juxtapose” educational dilemmas with ideas from literary theory, media studies, “and various texts from the humanities that, as a teacher, I am drawn to” (1997, p. 13). With her graduate work done in the field of film studies, Ellsworth brings a fresh and seemingly external perspective to the pedagogical concerns of power that are not well explored in the dominant K-12 pedagogy literature per se, as I have above argued. I say that her perspective is “seemingly external” because, Ellsworth, herself, professes that she does not write from a

background in pedagogy, that is, not from the school of education. She is a teacher, and, along with a heavy leaning on provocative ideas of Shoshana Felman's concept of subconscious processes in learning (the subconscious as third party in an otherwise two-party dialogue), Ellsworth draws her analysis from myriad classroom experiences, including some that are autobiographical, that is from her own education. She is, as are all teaching academics, an "insider" in this way, if an outsider in terms of disciplinary focus and affiliation.

At the core of Ellsworth's work is her central term, *address*, which is "a film studies term with a lot of theoretical and political baggage attached to it. . . What it boils down to is this question: Who does the film think you are?" (1997, p. 22). Analogously, Ellsworth asks of the reader, "Who do you think your students are?" with a corollary question, "Who, then, do they think themselves to be?—Who do they think they are?" (in response to how they are, in subtle but power-full ways, *addressed*. Here, one might notice a postmodern take on the underlying essence of Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson's (1967) basic platform of *relational* content within communication, but Ellsworth takes the relational concept from the family realm (of Watzlawick et al.) into the pedagogical realm, suggesting deep importance (like that of family) through her exposure of the intensely personal, even "intimate" "workings of power in pedagogy." As she explains, "A pedagogical mode of address is where the social construction of knowledge and learning gets deeply personal. It's a relationship whose subtleties can shape and misshape lives, passions for learning, and broader social dynamics" (p. 6). Concerned with this level of "intimacy," and guided by a postmodern skepticism of the supposedly power-equalized "communicative dialogue" espoused by Burbules (1993),

Ellsworth's book represents a rare and useful departure, within directly-pedagogical literature aimed at dialogue (her book, like Burbules's, published by Columbia University's Teachers College Press), adding depth to shallower and mainstream views of "power in the classroom," which tend more toward Manke's mandates of politeness, as I have exposed above. Within Ellsworth's question, "Who does the film think you are?" resides fertile ground for the discursive exploration of power in teaching and learning, as I will strive to demonstrate, at both situational and interactional levels of discourse, in my analysis in Chapters 5 and 6.

At that place of analysis, I shall also "juxtapose" (as Ellsworth might say) the ideas of cyberneticist-turned-quasi-phenomenologist Klaus Krippendorff, whose recently (2009) reprinted view of "I-Other" relations draws upon both Buber and Gadamer toward an I-Thou relationship in which "*participants constitute themselves in conversational practices of dialogical equality*" (2009, p. 123, emphasis in original). My intent is to conjoin these voices to help illuminate a communication ethic that crystallizes when Ellsworth's question meets Levinas's *radical alterity*—a sacred, self-defining conception of Otherness—as is richly and recently considered in Pinchevski's (2005) *By Way of Interruption*.

For now, I will remind that Foucault's power, when not in the form of domination, is not only power *over*, but often power *to*—though the product of this power (to do what?) is always open to critique. But this is not the mainstream view of *power* in pedagogy, which yet places control and authority, in the guise of responsibility, in the teacher's hands: as traffic cop in a view of communication as directional, as transmission.

Against this tradition, I seek to press beyond the transmission model and the simple deployment of face-saving techniques. I seek to move educational dialogue forward, using the traction availed through dialogue theory's current and fruitful exploration of Buber's meeting, of Bakhtin's chronotope, of Burke's identification, of Levinas's radical alterity, of Bohm's (1990) productive mechanisms, of Hawes's (2004) social action, and, especially, using the dominant theme of Deetz, Arnett, Shotter, Hawes, Pearce and Pearce, Wood, and others gathered together by Anderson, Baxter and Cissna (2004), that is, in *difference*. From there, I hope to draw out and put to work the productive relations of power that are presently under-theorized in pedagogical literature.

A Power-Full Dilemma in Traditional Situations of Teaching and Learning

Having looked at foundational concepts of power in educational settings, I will now present a prevalent and discourse-constraining dilemma—owing to power imbalance—regarding dialogue in all formal (especially graded) settings of teaching and learning, as a generalized practice. This is a move I make toward framing my two chapters of analysis as providing *special* resources—since arising from adult ed, not K-12—toward the development of a communication-theory orientation to “dialogue in teaching and learning,” since dialogue, as idealized, is especially hard to observe and study in customary arenas of “classroom discourse”; indeed, some, like Cazden (1988/2001), wonder if even feasible, there, given this dilemma.

I must revisit the fact that one variable or condition is undeniably prevalent within educational settings, especially those of the classroom, and that variable is power, or, as Foucault (1994/1982) would say, relations of power. By connecting Freire's (1998) socioeconomic critique with Foucault's institutional view, we see a compelling dilemma

that challenges, for all participants, the prospect of dialogue in settings of teaching and learning: a societal and institutionalized imbalance in relations of power, in other words, an expected arrangement of power relations that privileges teacher over learner, especially in granting the teacher grading power over the student.

The teacher is free to say almost anything, within reason and the bounds of appropriateness; the student, on the other hand is constrained to monitor his or her commentary, such that any challenge, let's say to the teacher's authority or point of view, is offered only within the boundaries established—explicitly or tacitly—by that teacher as acceptable. As Parker Palmer (1998) explains in *The Courage to Teach*, “Students are marginalized people in our society. The silence that we face in the classroom is the silence that has always been adopted by people on the margin” (p. 45). Palmer then draws analogies between students-in-general and certain groups whose voices have been marginalized, until recently. He writes, “For years, African-Americans were silent in the presence of whites—silent, that is, about their true thoughts and feelings” (p. 45).

While things have changed, Parker writes, in the social arena, “as blacks and women move from the margins to the center and speak truths that people like me need to hear” (p. 45), such a change has not taken place—or at least not taken root, for students, the youthful in particular. Adolescent or old(er), when grades are on the line, the student speaks, in the main (if he or she speaks at all), so as to satisfy the teacher's need for confirmation, within limits set by the teacher for dissent, else the student risk some form of sanction, in particular a lowering, immediate or eventual, of his or her grade.

This power-full dilemma (as regards prospects for dialogue, especially) may seem an inconsequential entity in this study, since I am not studying a classroom, proper, with

grades assigned, but instead a professional development project, where the currency is not a grade awarded by the professor; rather the currency in these settings is something more at a balance of *perceived competence* and *face needs* among faculty colleagues, as has been well demonstrated in the investigation of interaction, discussion, and questioning practices within academic colloquia (Tracy & Muller, 1994; Tracy & Naughton, 1994).

However, I believe it relevant to point out this prevalent dilemma to bolster my central claim that the present data indeed arise—expressly *because of* an immunity to this prevalent dilemma in teaching and learning, that of power imbalance—from a very *special* setting within the larger pedagogical arena. If an analyst wants to observe, gather data, and analyze toward the development of ideas and ideals toward informing the practice of dialogue in teaching and learning, such an analyst would be ill advised to look for the underpinnings and manifestations of such practice within a setting that is indeed governed by grades. For that reason—namely, that what I seek to study and theorize in the classroom is nearly as scarce, there, as a unicorn—I shall proceed to unpack this central dilemma, grounding this perspective within voices central to dialogue and dialogism, as canvassed earlier in this review of the literature.

This dilemma, I propose, further aligns to the analogous imbalance identified as a central dispute between Martin Buber and Carl Rogers, during their well explicated (Cissna & Anderson, 2002) dialogue in 1957. A centerpiece of these authors' prominent re-transcription and re-thinking of the Buber-Rogers dialogue is their emphasis on the exchange in which Buber challenges Rogers's insistence of the very possibility of a *mutuality* that would transcend the roles of patient and therapist; indeed, Rogers named it

the very indicator of successful therapy, a marker of sorts that the therapy may have reached its productive conclusion. Yet Rogers conceded, with Buber's challenge a strong one, that it is only in rare and fleeting circumstances—Cissna and Anderson (2002) note that these occur only as “moments of genuine mutuality” (p.183)—that mutuality is *not* constrained by the institutional and interpersonal roles within a therapy session.

It is possible, if uncommon, then, that some form or sense of mutuality might exist in a therapeutic setting, but it is certainly not the norm. Nor, by extension, would one expect to see frequent and ongoing mutuality in the typical classroom. The patient comes to the therapist for needed professional help, both personal (desired wellness) and public (toward reputation); analogously, the student comes to the teacher for needed professional help, both personal (desired learning), and public, (toward a marketable degree). By definition, both contexts of communication feature unequal status and hierarchical roles, or as Friedman names them, “structural” differentiations in “role and function” (cited in Cissna & Anderson, 2002, p. 184). Indeed, Cissna and Anderson conclude that “the structure of the situation, one person asking another for help in a professional context, necessarily means that the relationship cannot be a relationship between equals” (p. 184). And yet, in the same paragraph these authors propose that “Most if not all truly challenging occasions for dialogue involve role-unequal interaction,” which is to grant some degree of possibility for dialogue, albeit one marked by challenge, despite the presumable imbalances within “role-unequal interaction.”

Buber insisted, despite Rogers's contestation, that the therapist-client relationship all but obliterates the prospect of mutuality, and I acknowledge that an equivalent fundamental problem, as regards prospects for mutuality, exists in the classroom,

especially a classroom in which grades are assigned. Even among students too young to necessarily understand the dynamic between their classroom participation and their grades, such as the elementary school children studied in Alexander's (2008) prolific and recent study, this imbalance of status between teacher and student played out prominently. Aiming to show that the training of teachers could produce improvements in dialogic interaction in the classroom, Alexander includes, among five qualifications and concerns presented following his analysis, that while he saw marked improvement in the dialogic talk of the teachers, less classroom work was evident and successful and producing similar gains in the talk of the students. The dilemma facing would-be partners-in-dialogue within the arena of formalized teaching and learning, is, I argue, rooted in the difference in status and even power between teacher and student, especially as regards grading.

In the case at hand, the present *situation* of teaching and learning in a formalized, institutional setting is free of this dilemma. Admittedly, I did not anticipate nor seek a research setting wherein the participants would be free of this dilemma; rather, it is the fact of their freedom from this status inequity that the dilemma itself emerges as salient in this chapter's pre-data analysis, as is presently underway. The "students" in this event include tenured faculty, as well as professional staff, and even the participants whose institutional roles are, indeed, as students (the graduate student assistants to the three professors) are not receiving grades for their performance as learners. My hope, therefore, is that this setting will reveal elements of *dialogue in teaching and learning* that would be difficult, if even possible, to find under the customary conditions, where teachers grade students. What we have here, then, is an especially fertile situation for

finding dialogue in teaching and learning, one that may or may not reveal nuances of the grade dilemma, but certainly without being dominated by it, since none of the participants has a grade that could be jeopardized by saying something outside of expected approval, though other situational concerns may surface.

Dialogue in Educational Settings: Socratic Origins, Then and Now

Let us now widen our perspective of educational dialogue, across both literatures and across time. Dialogue, itself, is defined many ways (when defined at all, and—often—the term is not defined at all, yet used pivotally), within the variegated and overlapping theoretical interests of the school of education and the school of communication. Scholars interested in the goings-on where education meets communication are therefore likely to at least brush up against both complementary and competing ideas and theories of dialogue. The term is everywhere, a point supported by Craig's (2006) study of the seemingly unlimited uses and meanings of the term in public discourse.

The modern call for “dialogue” in formal learning settings arises prominently in the revolutionary teaching and writing of Paolo Freire (2006/1970), who used the term centrally toward his pedagogy of *liberation*, or, as he named it in the very title of his 1970 manifesto, “pedagogy of oppressed.” However, the championing of the dialogically *liberated* learner (a considerer, a questioner, even a challenger, and, in that way, a threat!), of course goes back much further, even to ancient times. In fact, Socrates is often attributed as the founder of dialogic teaching (Bohm, 1990; Ellinor & Gerard, 1999). Dialogue scholar Robert Anderson, of the Morris J. Wosk Center for Dialogue at Simon Fraser University (not to be confused with prominent dialogist Rob Anderson, of St.

Louis University, also cited in this dissertation) provides an exceptionally thorough critical examination of Plato's use of Socrates, which propagated the dialogic model of teaching and learning that inheres in the well-known "Socratic method":

Some say the dialogues present Plato's settled views through a mouthpiece (presumably Socrates). And another tradition has developed to explain Plato's "anonymity" or "silence" in the dialogues, viewing them as his way of stating various perspectives on democracy, and having them "rubbed against one another and tested" (Plato's words). (n.d., second paragraph under "A Definition by Avoidance")

Of the numerous references to Socrates, whether relatively casual (Isaacs, 1999) or more formally explicated (Burbules, 1993), Anderson's is among the more revealing perspectives, invoking Plato's motivations to couch politically incorrect viewpoints via the "mouthpiece" of not just Socrates, but Socrates in "dialogue" with students, real or invented. Such revelation serves as an interesting side note, regarding the history of dialogue theory, and it also brings us back to Bakhtin's (1984b) skepticism of any source as bearing the right to be named as the "origin" of a discourse or as its ending point. It is Bakhtin (1984b), after all, who reminds us that we join the conversation "in progress" and that "the ultimate word of the world and about the world has not yet been spoken" (p. xxxix).

Whether Socrates was a teacher gifted in a special form of pedagogy based on give and take, the dialectic approach to the seeking of truth, or simply a safer mouthpiece for Plato to use in propounding unpopular ideas, the *idea* of Socratic dialogue, at historically and culturally understood, looms large as a foundation for modern ideas of

dialogue in the classroom. Perhaps we misunderstand Socrates, but we misunderstand productively, as regards the added impetus for two-way talk in the classroom. Indeed, sometimes it is misunderstanding, not understanding, that serves as the catalyst for dialogue that is truly generative of something new, which is one reason the “handover” method of educational dialogue is antithetical to modern understandings of the term. Socrates said it first, maybe.

From Socratic Method to Socratic Repertoire

A recent development in Socratic interpretation comes from Burbules (1993), who, citing Gadamer’s hermeneutics (language as interpretive) in his book’s introduction, points out that Socrates, even as generally (mis)understood, performed his dialogue in a number of contrasting ways, such that an apt term for the Socratic “method” would be more of a Socratic “repertoire” (1993, p. x). Here, we are reminded of Alexander’s (2005) “repertoire,” cited above. This enlargement of what is meant by “Socratic” is very important, as it answers some of the criticism (e.g. Ellsworth, 1997; Gutierrez, 1993) of the Socratic method, or any “planned classroom dialogue” as simply a tool to lead the student to dogmatic presuppositions that serve mainly to maintain power in the guise of free and open collaboration toward truth. The idea of a Socratic *repertoire* makes room for some degree of “leading the student” in predetermined directions, but it does not wholly relegate the Socratic method as merely a tool for a more interactive (and possibly, thereby, more effective) indoctrination.

Burbules’s (1993) idea of the Socratic *repertoire* (beyond the narrower *method*) makes room for spontaneous and generative processes into unknown territory; it is not a predestined trip around the lake. Indeed, Burbules is sharply criticized by Ellsworth

(1997), in her book considered earlier in this chapter, as regards power. While Ellsworth believes that Burbules “sidesteps a more specific study of *what* happens and *how* in actual instances of dialogic teaching practice” (p. 99, emphasis in original), Burbules’s foregrounding of dialogue in teaching remains monumental, and his enlargement of Socratic *method* to *repertoire*, serves well to bolster this still-developing view. The door, to a dialogic and liberating classroom openness, is, itself, opening, and Socrates is perhaps smiling, mainstream criticism notwithstanding. Meanwhile, Ellsworth’s incisive critique of Burbules’s processual vagueness adds further justification to the proposed dissertation, which will not sidestep, but stride right into a close inspection of “*what* happens and *how*” in the discursive practice of classroom dialogue.

Paolo Freire: Dialogue as Means of Liberation

Dialogue has clearly been a well known idea in pedagogy from Socrates through to the present. For one viable *turning* point in educational dialogue literature—being informed by Bakhtin, I hesitate to say *starting* point, which, as argued above, is a term as antithetical to his dialogism as is the idea of any “endpoint”—I would jump ahead to the work of educator and activist Paulo Freire, whose view of dialogue-in-education, if not theoretically rich, is certainly important and foundational to modern understandings, say those of the past 50 years. Before Freire, a scientific and/or socio-psychological orientation undergirded most of the relatively few *avant-garde* education tomes published during the middle third of the 20th century. With a few exceptions, such as the provocative and critical work of Jacques Barzun (c.f., *Teacher in America*, 1945/1954), the developments in educational reform, through the mid-60s, was marked by a

laboratory feel, in the name of science, although rarely toward tangible results. But the clinical tone of education reform did make way, around the late 1960s, to a wellspring of educational revolution that cried out, aided by Barzun's (1968/1993) continued voice, one way or another, for *liberation*. The scientific voice did not go away, as Barzun (1991) updates, maintaining his critique of largely-ineffectual education reform (Freire et al., notwithstanding): "The pseudo-scientific proposals for all the remedies required have proved themselves no better than superstitions or crypto-magical incantations" (p. ix). But, in the mid- to-late 1960s, the clinicians were largely drowned out by the din of the "open school," and it was Freire who led the way, as regards dialogue, front and center (Cochran-Smith, 1999).

Though it is Freire's voice that we best remember (the advantage of being picked up by ongoing critical theory), his was just one voice in the chorus, as the call grew widespread through the 1970s, from the college president or school principal on down (or up?) to the student, including, of course, the professor and teacher, for a mass freeing, a freeing of everyone involved in education: "Open sesame!" (Street?). Freire (1970/2006; 1987) saw dialogue as the opposing alternative to teaching as the handover of dominant ideology, a mechanism for the maintenance of power and the suppression of dissent. For example, in his major work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire writes, "The desire for conquest (or rather than necessity of conquest) is at all times present in antidialogical action. To this end the oppressors are attempting to destroy in the oppressed their quality as 'considerers' of the world" (1970/2006, p.139).

For Freire, dialogical action involved the opening of classroom discourse to include discussion and critique of the conditions surrounding the classroom, and much of

his early career was spent teaching literacy to indigenous villagers across Brazil (Freire, 1987; 1993). His goal was to open the minds and the capacities of the underclass, such that they would better understand their disadvantaged position in the social and political sphere and thereby become both motivated and empowered to take action to improve their situations and, more largely, to improve society. His was the first well-heard call in modern pedagogy for something in education expressly called *dialogue* (Cochran-Smith, 1999). And dialogue would be impossible without the understanding of the hegemonic forces of social inequity, understandings that would press, into the discussion, the muted underclass. He wanted his students to know their enemy.

Directly bearing on the idea of *classroom* dialogue is Freire's well-known metaphor of the problematic, but then-prevalent, "banking" model of pedagogy (1970), in which students are seen as empty containers needing to have information "deposited" by the teacher (or larger institution). This metaphor, while conceptually very basic, paved the way for much richer exploration of the idea of dialogue, such that early dialogue theorists—even those with broader focus, such as Arnett (1986)—often cited (and still do) Freire as a foundational voice in their work. Likewise, Sarles (1993), in his book, *Teaching as Dialogue*, invokes Freire from introduction to final chapter, including great emphasis upon the warning inherent in what he calls "Freire's problem," namely the vicious cycle wherein "those who are oppressed learned well the nature and dynamics of oppression. For many this is *the* lesson. As some formerly oppressed gain power in their lives, they tend to treat others in an oppressive manner (1993, p. 27, emphasis in original).

Freire's banking model reveals monologue. Dialogue, in contrast, is a valuing of multiple voices coming together in the classroom to explore new terrain, to see new resources, even within an understandable climate of cultural cynicism (Arnett & Arnesson, 1999). Freire's dialogic education critiques the traditional move of merely "depositing" known ideas from the dominant institution into the piggy banks of a suggestible and vulnerable underclass. Freire took educational dialogue from the shelves of philosophy, and used it like a machete, across the villages (and cities) of Brazil. Perhaps that is why we remember his voice best; he prominently solidified the bridge between philosophy and political science, and called it a new pedagogy, one of liberation. Along a path that Dewey, decades before (1916/1944), had suggested and then mapped, through long-term demonstration, giving rise to social and political aspects of education that yet fuel pedagogical innovation (Kliebard, 2006), Freire, as educator, *practiced* what he preached—to the point of cabinet-level national directorship and then, as the political tides turned in Brazil, imprisonment (as well biographed in Mayo, 1999), and the modern characterization of *dialogue as liberatory* remains rightfully his. The student must not be treated as if no more than an piggy bank for the filling, and of modest sums, at that; it is a simple premise but also elegant.

Thin as Freire's theoretical blade (the well-cited but relatively shallow banking model) may have been, he has used it with enormous productively, inspiring legions (myself included) to help bring ideas of liberation into both theoretical soundness and political actuality and to serve as an especially accessible metaphor for the shortcomings of traditional perspectives on teaching and learning, indeed casting a dark shadow on

both processes, in their traditional (and separate) embodiment. The cure for darkness is light; for Friere this light is called dialogue.

Enter Technique, in the Form of “Triadic” Dialogue

Clearly, the study of dialogue in teaching and learning that I here present will have to recognize, and work from, the idea that dialogue is more repertoire than simple technique, though some fairly recent educational literature disagrees. The scientific frame that had been, for a period, drowned out regained prominence toward the late 1980s (Gourlay, 2005), making way for the back-to-basics movement and also an understanding of educational dialogue as a simply a quick trio of orchestrated moves (and back) to handover an idea: *dialogue*, by name, but mere pennies into the piggybank, in effect. That is, mainstream educational definitions of dialogue, in pragmatic terms, have reduced the idea to what is often called the IRE interaction: initiation, response, and evaluation (Cazden, 1988/2001; Cooper & Simonds, 1999). Sometimes the model is known as IRF, with the third stage not E, for evaluation, but F, for either “feedback” or “follow-up” (Gourlay, 2005). In either case, the three-move classroom interaction is nominally referred to as *triadic dialogue* (Lemke, 1990). Despite the popularity (and ease of teachability) of the triadic dialogue approach, researchers have found that it is actually practiced infrequently in the classroom. For example Nystrand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, and Long (1999) found that dialogic discourse, thusly defined in the triadic sense, comprised only about 15% of instruction in the more than 100 middle and high school classes examined in their study. It is an interesting finding, considering the frequency with which Cazden (2001) refers, in her book, to teacher speaking time as generally two-thirds of all the classroom talk: teachers owning the I and the E, though not the R.

Furthermore, triadic dialogue is not only infrequent, it is of dubious value toward current ideals of constructivist education (Loughran, 2006). Indeed, as communication and educational theory evolve, illuminating the generative function of dialogue, the triadic model has come under significant fire. As Gourlay (2005) writes, “The value of triadic dialogue has been debated in general education, where it has attracted criticism for being over-formulaic and restrictive, although recent research has pointed to the range of functions that may be fulfilled by the follow-up move” (p. 403).

We see textual support of this critique in Alexander (2005), wherein the IRE/F interactions Alexander recorded, transcribed, and analyzed indeed showed problems of shallowness and artifice:

Interactions tended to be brief rather than sustained, and teachers moved from one child to another in rapid succession in order to maximise participation, or from one question to another in the interests of maintaining pace, rather than developed sustained and incremental lines of thinking and understanding. (p. 8)

Abbey (2005), writing in the online journal, *New Horizons for Learning*, extends Alexander’s view, noting the pedagogical limitations inherent in the third, and “final,” step of the dialogic “triad”:

It is rather less common for answers to be responded to in a way that helps the student and/or the class to learn from what has been said. It remains the case that after such extended responses the feedback is often minimal and judgmental (“excellent,” “not quite what I was looking for,” or the not-so-

ambiguous “Ye-es . . .”) rather than sufficiently informative and scaffolding to promote deep learning. (p. 7)

In fact, the preponderance of recent scholarly reference to IRE/F follows this critical vein. If IRE/F is brought up nowadays, it is for critique. For example, a recent and multi-faceted cross-examination of classroom discourse, in a volume edited by Cole and Zuengler (2008), which offers several contrasting and up-to-date methodologies of discourse analysis, the inadequacy of IRE/F is emphasized. For example, Mary Curran (2008) flatly states, in her essay “Narratives of Relevance: Seizing (or not) Critical Moments,” that the IRE/F triad “tends to discourage student initiation and repair work,” furthering that “This format makes it extremely difficult for students to initiate comments, ask questions, make a critique, and the like” (p. 92).

Drawing from an earlier essay, “Constraints and Resources in Classroom Talk: Issues of Equality and Symmetry,” by Van Lier, Curran (2008) shows the IRE/F format as a “closed, rather than open discourse format” because it “discourages interruption (or disruption)” (Van Lier, cited in Curran, p. 92). She further invokes Van Lier’s provocative metaphor of IRE/F dialogue as a “guided bus ride,” whose itinerary and destination seem (to the students) to unfold unknown and free but are actually well predetermined by the teacher/bus driver. Though the appearance is of an expedition into new territory, one party knows, even dictates, the destination, especially in pedagogical settings, where teachers are presumed adults, and learners not. Adult-ed literatures are another matter, as shall next be surveyed.

Dialogue as Conceived and Discussed in Adult Education and Training Contexts

Indeed, there is a growing cadre (of which Garrison and Archer, 2000, and also Sotto, 1994, are included) of fairly recent, if outnumbered, education-oriented scholars who write (directly or indirectly) of discursive processes in teaching and learning, but whose work focuses on *adult* education, *professional* training and development, *in-service* teacher education, and even (though rarely), upon *faculty* development. Since my data arise from a setting of teaching-and-learning comprised of adults, it is important, now that I have paid due attention to the foundational and still-dominant K-12 pedagogy, to also review that adult-ed literature, minority status notwithstanding within the broader pedagogical arena.

I begin by consulting Ron Arnett's 1992 book, *Dialogic Education*, since his book is aimed at the arena of college learning, that is, of young adults. From this start, I will then transition into settings oriented to working adults. Since Arnett is writing from not only a pedagogical focus, but also a communication-theory perspective, one notices immediately that his *dialogue* implies discursive characteristics beyond mere number of speakers. Now we are getting somewhere. For example, in a chapter titled "Between Persons," Arnett writes of *equality* as a defining characteristic in the dialogic college classroom. "Equality suggests that both the teacher and the student are important and worthy of being heard, even as both realize that the teacher possesses more information and expertise" (1992, p. 118). Since he is speaking of young-adult learners and not adult learners, *per se*, Arnett is yet careful to differentiate the teacher from the learner, qualifying, as we see in the passage quoted above, this *equality* that he requires. Citing Aristotle's *Nicomachian Ethics*, Arnett demystifies the paradoxical *equality* of which he speaks (one is reminded of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, in which "all animals are created

equal,” until the pigs have taken over and appended this constitutional edict with the qualification, “but some are more equal than others”), invoking Aristotle’s “proportionate equality.” Through this term, explains Arnett (1992), Aristotle proposed that “different positions and different abilities call for different responses. In essence to treat all the same, regardless of position and ability, is not equality. Equality respects difference and questions reliance on sameness” (p. 118). In the transition from K-12 pedagogical dialogue to that of the college arena—with that of adult learning not far ahead—we see movement into enriched discourse, if not discourse analysis by methodology.

Another important move of Arnett’s, in this same chapter, is his advocacy of questioning as a classroom discursive modality. Of course, questioning is a central feature of pedagogical dialogue in K-12 texts, particularly in the triadic dialogue discussed and critiqued above. But Arnett is talking about young adults, not children, and opening the floor to questioning from students over the age of 18 does require some bracing for what might come—indeed *embracing* of what may come. Admitting that “Students already bring a number of obstacles to the learning environment from lack of skill to disinterest” (readers who are undergraduate faculty nod in agreement, noting Arnett’s realism, by which he tempers his dialogic ideal), Arnett nonetheless proposes that “dialogic faculty” (and students) worked to fend off the defensiveness that naturally arises in such terrain of allowing questioning and inviting challenge from students, some of whom enter the discussion unskilled or disinterested.

What I find most provocative and unique across this chapter, and indeed Arnett’s whole book, is his affirmation of “the need for some anxiety in the learning process. Exploring new terrain is not always a comfortable journey” (p.120). To this point (in K-

12 literature), there is little written about dialogue that suggests unease or discomfort for the teacher, apart from the discomfort of trying something new in one's own methods. The discomfort, in Arnett, owes not to "trying something new," but to the unpredictability of dialogue, when conducted with young adults, a point Ellsworth (1997) echoes especially loudly, as she, with Arnett, moves to question, or in her words, to "trouble" dialogue, to explore "what different, less idealist, more useful conceptions of citizenship—and of education—open up the when I do so" (p. 16).

Just one year after Arnett's work appeared, Harvey Sarles (1993), writing from the University of Minnesota, published his afore-cited guide for dialogic undergraduate instruction, *Teaching as Dialogue*. Sarles's book, as did Arnett's, celebrates discomfort in the classroom, mocking the traditional college teacher modality he derides as "Teaching: the art of not losing (as frequently as possible)" (p. 92, parentheses in original). In contrast, the dialogic approach promulgated by Sarles embraces the inherent risks of the dialogic undergraduate classroom. "Every teacher who (properly!) opens s/himself to dialogue with s/his students runs a number of risks. . ." which span a range from "making a fool of s/himself (or being made a fool of) to loss of student interest and participation, to *turning-off* the students so their attention or concerns are elsewhere" (p. 92, emphasis and parenthetical comments in original).

However, there are shortcomings, by today's standards, in much of the dialogic emphasis as it was understood in the early 1990s, such as Sarles's. It is not necessarily a risk of losing face that Sarles refers to, in his "number of risks," it could be something as innocuous (to face concerns of the teacher) as a student's making "an embarrassing, apparently *crazy*, statement" (p. 96, emphasis in original). Alas, the dialogic pedagogy of

Sarles (1993) yet reveals a paucity of sensitivity to discursive features that central to current communicational views of dialogue, such that he extols undergraduate dialogue as a consistent means for the teacher who has *heard it all before* to remain alive in his own consciousness, to resist boredom” (p. 7). It is scarcely a view amenable to, for example, advocates of Bakhtin’s dialogism, such as Baxter (2004, 2006), to imagine that there is any dialogically-oriented college teacher who would profess to have “heard it all before.” Harking back to the K-12 orientation embedded in Manke’s (1994) “Sally would you like to sit down?” it does not surprise to find that Sarles’s (1993) advice to the teacher who has been surprised at a “*crazy*” student statement is to put a quick end to that line of commentary through a recommended response such as, “I’d like to see you after class,” as this type of response “seems to relieve the class from having to identify with this statement, and they rejoin my world again” (p. 96). Although dialogic pedagogy had indeed entered the literature of undergraduate instruction, in the 1990s, dialogic epistemology was still showing a Socratic, if not triadic, orientation toward the leading of the students toward a predestined goal.

A sharp contrast can be seen in recent teacher-development work centered upon dialogue, such as Barrera and Kramer’s (2009) “skilled dialogue” approach to teacher development. Skilled dialogue is developed in depth through their book, *Using Skilled Dialogue to Transform Challenging Interactions: Honoring Identity, Voice, and Connection*, a volume whose title alone bespeaks richer and more up-to-date discursive sensitivities. In their book, which does, in select places, employ discourse analytic methods to explore selected interactions in and out of classrooms, with quoted paragraphs shown in the left-hand column and descriptive analysis alongside to the right, Barrera and

Kramer reveal “harmonizing,” as the anchoring move, of six named moves, in their “skilled” approach.

To wit, the first five moves are welcoming, allowing, sense-making, appreciating, and joining. Harmonizing, the final stage (in a cyclical process that, actually, can jump around from this stage to that) is a process of discovering the “third choice” that is always present in the face of difference, as demonstrated in one transcribed excerpt wherein the teacher, in some conflict with a supervisor, helps to maintain a dialogic productivity and relational enhancement “by clearly identifying their two positions and explicitly communicating that one is not in opposition with another. . . without forcing a choice between the two” (Barrera & Kramer, 2009, p. 182). This is a fairly up-to-date view of dialogue, as a practice that can be applied in adult settings. Though also useful in K-12 pedagogy, clarify the authors, the book’s clear focus, as a resource for teacher education, concerns adult interaction, an interesting departure from teacher-ed material concerned only with classroom events.

A related and recent development, in undergraduate-oriented pedagogical literature, is to explore dialogic approaches to learning contexts outside of the classroom, yet with the idea, earlier in Arnett (1987, 1992), in mind: there is an inherent discomfort, not just for the undergraduate professor, but also for the learner, in dialogic processes, those featuring mutuality, if also role differentiation, in teaching and learning. Yet these discomforts can be routinely steered toward productive outcomes, which themselves become quite rewarding.

For example, Matthew Olmstead (2007) writing in a volume edited by Russell and Loughran, *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education*, discusses and explores, from

the perspective of the student, two contrasting approaches, during his pre-service practicum at the end of his teacher training. His first of two “associate teachers” (supervisors) left him “demoralized” by an approach that was *not* dialogic: “It was made clear to me that my impressions of the lesson were less important than my associate teacher’s interpretations of the lesson” (p. 146). In contrast, his second associate teacher employed a dialogic approach, in which a community of learning was celebrated, and, though there were many moments of discomfort, since this second associate teacher tended to withhold feedback until several days of observation, there was an expectation that both teacher and teacher in training could learn equally from one another. Olmstead concludes his essay by stating that “Learning to teach is more than an apprenticeship of observation; it is a relationship between associate teacher and teacher candidate built on mutual respect and trust (p. 148).

As this review of dialogic education theory in post-secondary (post K-12) contexts moves toward a strictly adult arena, one current figure stands perhaps tallest of them all, and that is Jane Vella, an unabashed devotee of Paulo Friere. Vella’s (2008) most recent book, *On Teaching and Learning*, extends her work in dialogue theory into contexts of not just adult education, but also teacher education, along with applications that span all settings of teaching and learning, including K-12. Her earlier works, including *How Do They Know They Know: Evaluating Adult Learning* (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1997), *Taking Learning to Task* (Vella, 2001), and *Dialogue Education at Work* (Vella and Associates, 2004) provided the groundwork for this latest work, which now includes direct application to the college arena, including settings from the small learning group to the large lecture hall and even to online learning formats. For

example, in this latter arena of online learning, Vella (2008) answers her own question, “Is virtual dialogue possible?” with the proposition that “dialogue is never *virtual* but always real and nourishing” (p. 167). In the foreword to Vella’s *On Teaching and Learning*, Joanna Ashworth (2008)—who directs the Dialogue Programs at Simon Fraser University’s Morris J. Wosk Center for Dialogue in Vancouver, British Columbia (where she collaborates with colleague, Robert Anderson, previously cited in this review of the literature for his analysis of Plato’s motives for propagating Socrates dialogic methods)—proposes that Vella, in “taking her inspiration from leaders in adult education such as Paulo Freire and Malcolm Knowles,” presents now a wider-ranging view of dialogue education that is broadly “about creating a learning space in which learners feel a sense of belonging and inclusion” (p. xiii). In all of these contexts from adult ed to the university, and even others articulated in separate chapters in her book, such as in school leadership and a health-care settings, Vella (2008) stays true to her Freire-inspired roots:

As university professors, all over the world have been discovering, dialogue education brings you, the teacher, to a new role. You are no longer the only knower in the room, the only person at the point of power, the transmitter of facts and figures. Now you are listener, designer, researcher, knowledgeable resource, teacher, coach and judge. (p. 211)

Furthermore, in her glossary listing for *dialogue*, itself, Vella (2008) proposes that “the dialogue in dialogue education is not between the teacher and the learners, but among learners, of whom the teacher is one” (p. 216). Here we see, a very important blurring of the boundaries between the roles of teacher and learner, and that is a compelling proposition, given that this dissertation is studying, as its participants, its data,

an amalgam of teachers and learners, all of whom could (and in various roles outside of the research site, do) wear either hat.

Vella's (2008) recent update brings us to one more important landmark along the pathway of this literature review, in which I am tracing the developments in "dialogic education" from K-12, to the university classroom and related environs, and ultimately onto the arena of greatest present interest, that of adult learning, faculty development in particular. I refer to Freire's (1998) own *Pedagogy of Freedom*, which, according to translator Patrick Clark, was two-thirds complete at the time of Freire's death in 1997 and was written mainly for the graduate seminar on liberation pedagogy that Freire and Clark were (except for Freire's death) to team-teach at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. As noted above from Vella's (2008) glossary, the movement of the last dozen years, including in the final writings of Freire, aims to blur the boundaries between teaching and learning. As Freire (1998) explains, "To teach is not to transfer knowledge, but to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge" (p. 30). Furthermore, and even more directly, "Whoever teaches learns in the act teaching, and whoever learns teaches in the act of learning . . . to learn, then, logically precedes to teach" (p. 30). And, for Freire, it is not enough to strive for these ideals only as classroom pedagogy; the ideals, bringing together the many virtues of teaching and learning, must be lived:

When we live our lives with the authenticity demanded by the practice of teaching that is also learning, and learning that is also teaching, we are participating in a total experience that is simultaneously directive, political, ideological, gnostic, pedagogical, aesthetic, and ethical. In this

experience, the beautiful, the decent, and the serious form a circle with hands joined. (pp. 30-31).

I mean to foreground, as is seen in the most recent developments in the literature of dialogic education, the “circle with hands joined” that, conceptually and definitionally, unites teacher and learner in a joint process in which the roles alternate, blur, and, in effect, become one role, engaged in one activity. This unification of teaching and learning into one singular entity has been noted (though also overlooked or, at least, understated) in the writing of another member of the top pantheon of currently prominent educational theorists (in this case, especially among those identifying with the constructivist movement), Russian author, Lev Vygotsky.

For example, regarding understatement, in *Vygotsky's Legacy: A Foundation for Research and Practice*, Gredler and Shields (2008) make reference to Vygotsky's joined term “teaching/learning” (in Russian, *obuchnie*) without batting a scholarly eyelash. It scarcely catches their attention, that the two processes have been merged into one conjoined term. These authors are more interested in the relationship between teaching/learning and cognitive development, and they pay far more attention to Vygotsky's focused exploration of “zones of proximal development,” or ZPDs (a term actually originating in the work of Ernst Meumann and other psychologists, according to Gredler and Shields). In contrast, Vygotsky's joining of teaching/learning is of central importance (although antithetical) to Usher and Edwards (2007), who, in their provocative volume, *Lifelong Learning—Signs, Discourses, Practices*, aim to “extend our own meaning of lifelong learning by radicalizing the ‘and’ found in the discourses of learning and teaching” (p.149). The authors attribute Vygotsky's joining of

teaching/learning not as some kind of conceptual breakthrough of Vygotsky but as merely a feature of the Russian language (hence the Russian perspective), since the Russian word *obuchnie* translates directly in the conjoined form: teaching/learning, which, they explain, suggests that in Vygotskian psychology, teaching/learning represents “two sides of the same cultural coin immanent in and co-emerging from the practices of each other, rather than teaching *and* learning” (p. 150, emphasis in original).

By extension, constructivist approaches within current pedagogy also translate to constructivist approaches to teacher training and teacher development. One force that is driving renewed interest in the training of college faculty is that of technological mandates (King & Lawler, 2003). Whereas the authors acknowledge a presumption among college faculty members—a presumption of course dubious when overgeneralized—that college-level faculty already know how to teach, the pressure upon faculty members to learn *new technologies* has opened a space for desired faculty development, within which other issues may be addressed. As King and Lawler (2003) explain, “Professional development programs not only hold the possibility of helping teachers learn to use technology but also provide forums for them to share their questions and solutions and to discover alternatives together” (p. 10). This idea expands upon earlier methodological work in dialogically-oriented teacher training, for example Brookfield’s (1995) emphasis on multiple parties in critical reflection and the earlier work of Lawler and King (2000) regarding reflective practice. Toward dialogic sensitivities and constructivist practices, King and Lawler (2003) further that the idea of reflective practice must now be updated to involve the reflections of authentic and even multiple “voices” during training: rather than professional development meaning training

sessions to inculcate the ‘party line’ developers may be able to see the potential of educators and trainers exploring their worldviews and developing their voices” (p. 11). This mandate for a multi-vocal critical reflection is likewise supported in Cranton (1996), who explains, “educators learn about teaching by talking about their experiences becoming aware of the assumptions and expectations they have questioning these assumptions and possibly revising their perspectives” (p. 2).

To conclude this review of pedagogical (not communicational) conceptual understandings of dialogue in teaching and learning (and prior to moving into a review of relevant studies conducted), I call back to Van Lier’s (2008) “bus ride” metaphor, which, all said, characterizes the best-known current technique of educational dialogue, in its triadic sense, and it also provides an easy target for critique, as rendered by critical pedagogies, such as Van Lier’s and, more recently, Curran’s (2008). Even these critiques go only part of the way, however, as such current critical pedagogy is more aimed at the increased allowance of individual voices (such that each may speak) than in understanding the dialogic epistemology and even phenomenology, as I propose to work out through my analysis and as I will now show as of minimal import across existing discursive studies of classroom interaction and dynamics.

Recent and Relevant Discourse Analysis Employed in Pedagogy Literature

Although neither discourse studies literature nor that of pedagogy avails an exemplar of “dialogic discourse analysis,” especially not in the teaching-and-learning learning situation, *per se*, this not to say that “classroom discourse” has not been studied with attention to larger context and an appreciation for dialogic ideals, whether or not named as such. Linguists and other investigators interested centrally in language

processes have studied classroom interaction since the 1970s (e.g., Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, who catalogued 22 classroom speech acts), and the pedagogy literature has seen a recent and discourse-centered movement toward rigorous discourse-analytic (DA) investigation on classroom talk. As I will explain below, it is my intent to borrow from methodological techniques available in a number of these recent studies, yet without committing to a single framework or taxonomy, save for the developmental (open to change, as discovered through use) use of the proposed but untested “pragmatics of dialogue” model I developed with the invaluable aid of Robert Craig. Here, then, are some examples of pedagogical studies from which I borrow methodology and also contrast my work.

Qualitative, especially discursive analytic, research in classroom discourse has been gaining momentum since at least the early 1980s. One early example is foundation-laying work, oriented to interactional sociolinguistics of John Gumperz (1981), who, writing in the volume, *Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings* (Green & Wallat, 1981), proposed a model and research program regarding “conversational influence and classroom learning” (focused, as usual, however, upon interactions among young children). Gumperz’s essay accompanies, in the volume, another relevant study, this one by long-standing classroom discourse specialist Louise Wilkinson (1981). Her chapter presents analysis of teacher-student interaction, wherein Wilkinson revealed complexities that complicate the oft-taken-for-granted “teacher expectation model”; that is, she showed that a teacher’s initial beliefs about a student’s competence do not necessarily predict the perceived quality of subsequent teacher-student interactions. Though she does not use the term dialogue, the processes she studies surely show her

close interest in the subtleties, and even power dynamics (impositions, whether intentional or not, of teacher upon learner), in situational frames of student-teacher interaction. As the dialogue—however conceived—unfolds over the course of a learning event, things change at both interactional and situational levels; this has been clear, if not well unpacked, for some 30 years.

From the pedagogy standpoint, then, along with the previously discussed work in classroom dialogue by Alexander (2005; 2008), another prime example of discourse analytic methods informing pedagogy is the fresh volume of Cole and Zuengler (2008), which presents five well-contrasting DA analyses of a single set of classroom data (consisting of transcribed excerpts from a semester of classroom discussion and some class-related documents). Whereas this five-perspective study does feature a predominantly *linguistic* orientation to the study of student talk, the work is more pedagogical than discursively aimed. Its funding originated from the U.S. Department of Education, through a group called the Center on English Learning and Achievement. The learning of English or, more generally, of second-language acquisition (i. e., “L2 acquisition”) is, in fact, the pedagogical sub-arena that gives impetus (and funding) to much of the present movement toward DA analysis of classroom discourse featuring transcripts and close analysis. That is, the principal present interest in discursive study within settings of teaching and learning—such that it is, so as to build upon as a methodological platform—are principally centered right now upon issues and practices regarding the teaching and learning of a second language. That is the hot topic as regards current DA work in educational settings.

Even so narrowed, the literature presents some latitude in analytic orientation, however, as shown through the five contrasting DA approaches presented in Cole and Zuengler (2008), approaches that are “organized successively from a close examination of language forms and functions to consideration at a much broader level of the various overlapping communities within which the students participate” (p. iv). For Example, John Hellermann (2008) uses techniques specific to conversation analysis (CA) “to determine the subtleties of teacher uptake to student responses and other comments” (p. 50), mainly toward making his major point that what may have appeared, short of close scrutiny of turn taking and sequence, to be open and free participation in classroom discussion was actually a closed, teacher directed phenomenon he names, “the teacher pursuing a response to her own question” (p. 50). One mechanism he uses to support this claim is the identification of frequent use of the IRE/F format, which has been presented and critiqued earlier in this prospectus (in the review of the literature) as “triadic dialogue.”

Another prominent example of DA-oriented work appearing within this “L2” sub-arena of second-language acquisition is Walsh’s (2006) *Approaches to Studying Classroom Discourse*, in which the author mainly (after some review of existing models and methods) presents his SETT model (Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk) as a framework for teacher self-examination of classroom discussion and discussion leading. Though not oriented to *dialogue*, by name, Walsh’s work further substantiates the observation that the primary activity in DA studies in education literature is concerned with L2 processes, yet another restriction (along with a K-12 orientation) in the present DA work in educational settings.

Nonetheless, Walsh's (2006) goal is to provide, through his SETT model, for the development of a framework for understanding classroom discourse that "might be used to enhance teachers' awareness of the complex interrelationships between language, interaction, and learning" (p. 111), particularly through self-reflection. That is, he has developed a model for studying classroom discourse that is meant for the teacher to use, as opposed to "alternative approaches to the investigation of classroom discourse mainly from the outside researcher's perspective" (p. 111).

Of chief utility in my own analysis, though I have chosen not to adapt any single and ostensibly complete model or taxonomy, is Walsh's (2006) list of 14 "interactional features" of classroom talk (though he lists these in terms of *teacher* moves, expressly). His taxonomy is shown as a list of teacher initiations and responses, labeled A through N, that includes such discursive actions as scaffolding, direct repair, and even "extended wait-time" (p. 67). In particular, this item, wait time, informs my methodology, in terms of how I have chosen to transcribe my selected segments. Whereas I do not show the micro pauses that are part of every utterance (as might be shown in conversation analysis), I was on the lookout for timing patterns, including those of wait times, that stand out or seem to have influence on subsequent patterns and sequence of interaction in the classroom. This is among the clearer-cut benefits to me of Walsh's SETT model, among others less concrete, toward aiding the open-ended analysis of the training-setting interaction.

Of further direct and immediate interest, toward my informed, if open-ended, approach to performing my own discourse analysis, is the recent and thorough volume by Henning (2008), *The Art of Discussion-Based Teaching*. This transcript-filled volume

presented me with a clear-cut, updated, and complete look at the pragmatic constructs of classroom discussion, naming the moves and counter moves, for teacher and student. Henning aided my analysis through his transcribed segments, twin “rubrics” (taxonomies) of classroom moves, one for student talk and one for teacher talk. First he charts 21 distinct types of student talk, organized into six categories (such as “comments on the ideas of other students” under “Student to Student Interaction” and “utilizes conceptual vocabulary from current coursework” under “Content Knowledge” (p. 37). In the following chapter he presents a listing of teacher discourse types, which he presents in his “Summary of Teacher Follow up Moves,” which provided me with a simpler list (eight items), including such things as “Rejection: The teacher rejects a student response” and “Cue: The teacher provides a clue or direct student attention toward a particular aspect of the question. . .” (p. 64). What is especially helpful to my analysis is that, in Henning’s scheme, the initial move of interest is that of student response. In other words, Henning presumes the teacher’s originating utterance. It is when the student responds that Henning takes note, a point that supports my definition of Stage 1, in the Pragmatics model.

I would call Henning’s (2008) stance, shown in his designation of “student response” as the first move of interest, as a marker of the relevance and theoretical recency of his work. Earlier traditions in classroom discussion do not begin with the student response. For example, to sample mid-way back into the modern era of pedagogy literature, earlier characterized as taking root in the 1960s and 70s, Seiler, Schuelke, and Lieb-Brilhart (1984), writing in *Communication for the Contemporary Classroom*, do discuss “classroom discussion,” but in only one section (downplayed at that) of a two-

part chapter headed, “Communication: Lecture and Discussion Methods” (p. 132).

Whereas their book does portrays the movement underway toward opening spaces for student voices, especially in terms of “effective versus ineffective learning climates” (p. 19), their text nonetheless indicates the privileging of the teacher’s role and voice over the voice of the student. The authors go as far as to point out, for example, that “the teacher’s personality and temperament will determine how much freedom students will be given and whether the discussion method [as opposed to lecture] is even suitable for the objectives” (p. 150). Note that the term *dialogue* is altogether missing from the 1984 book, written for teachers in training. This is the older motif: discussion as teacher-centered.

Fast-forward to present, and we find that significant developments and refinements have transpired, as regards both understandings and methods of analyzing classroom discussion. For example, Henning’s (2008) aforementioned study aided me by providing a variety of exemplars of things to look for in my transcripts. The moves listed in his twin taxonomies are illustrated and demonstrated through the analysis of numerous samples of transcribed classroom discussion. He doesn’t just list his set of moves, he shows each of them, several times, functioning in transcribed classroom discussion. Compared to the teacher-first understanding of classroom discussion characterized in Seiler, Schuelke, and Lieb-Brilhart (1984), we see quite a change in emphasis at present, where we might now consider first a student comment and then a teacher follow-up.

Most of all, Henning’s (2008) work serves as a reminder to me to remain vigilant for interactions ostensibly initiated by the student, as well as sequences that follow teacher initiation. In the main, my dialogic orientation (see following section) involves

closely examining turns, exchanges, and sequences in search of clues as to processes of co-creation, of innovation, of conflicting views met and engaged, of difference invigorated—of what communication theory celebrates as *dialogue*.

My hope is that this study will further build upon and add to the above-named developments in discourse-analytic methods of studying classroom discourse—restricted as these now are in the literature, because of their focus on L2 processes in K-12 arenas. I further strive to contribute to this literature by developing an expressly communication-oriented form of dialogic analysis, one owing to current trends, advanced by individual and joint efforts by Craig and Tracy (as abundantly cited in this study), particularly the trends in understanding *communication as practice*, and in *metadiscourse* as a productive means of bridging theory and practice, ideas to be explored in more detail in Chapter 4, Methodology.

Sharpening the Focus upon the *Dialogic Situation* of Faculty Development Training

Even in recent work, such as Alexander's (2005, 2008), wherein his well-asserted ideas of larger frames for educational dialogue concern the social and cultural levels (comparing, for example, ideals and understandings of education, itself, among different nations and even continents), a more localized-situational unpacking has yet to come to fruition, a status I hope to raise a notch through this study. Hence, I propose that my approach is breaking some ground in pedagogically oriented discourse studies. As such, this chapter is as exploratory as definitive, a status that warrants some preliminary substantiation of the expressly situational analysis to follow, in Chapter 5, prior to the

interactional level of analysis I present in Chapter 6, using the pragmatics of dialogue model, as outlined

I will now delve into some important already-known ramifications of studying “the situation,” itself, as a form of discursive analysis. The sum of this preliminary analysis is presented to solidify a platform for the forthcoming discourse analysis of my *situation* in Chapter 5, in which I analyze my data toward illuminating discernible and arguably central (to the prospects and processes of dialogue), *situational elements*. In other words, I have striven, in Chapter 5, to uncover and explore key features of what I propose to call the “dialogic situation,” the larger discursive arena in which the prospectively dialogic interaction unfolds among the participants.

By way of contrast, I remind that the subsequent analytic chapter (Chapter 6) looks more closely at the interactional dialogic processes of topical discussion, the ups and downs that occur during selected moments of discussion. There, I look *within* the situation, to regard and explore the interaction therein, as revealed in the recorded data and supported by interviewing. But first, the larger, situational frame must be examined, as I herein strive to do. In sum, before taking a relatively “micro” perspective—one examining specific interactions—as regards dialogue in this specialized, faculty-development arena of teaching and learning, I explore a more *macro* view—the larger situational frame in which these interactions occur in this educational setting.

It is important to note, however, that I do not use the term *macro* in the larger and prevalent sociological, sense (e.g., Gerstein, 1987). Therein, the idea of the *macro*, as regards language and social interaction, places emphasis on such broad societal factors as history, economics, and politics, as demonstrated in Alexander’s work, cited above in this

chapter. In contrast to customary uses, the *macro* scope I intend to utilize is not fundamentally societal, but, as I have said, *situational*. Hence, whereas I am convinced of the salience of a “macro-micro” dynamic, akin to structuration sensitivities of, say, Giddens (1984) and later Desanctis and Poole (1990), I shall, from this point forward, generally prefer the term *situational*, to more sharply characterize this larger arena I intend to unpack, within which “micro”—that is, *interactional*—processes of dialogue do or do not transpire, in topical discussion.

Not a Container, but a *Situation* that Shapes and Takes Shape

As I have stated, I seek in this study to identify and explore the situational variables, discursive in nature, that bear upon the emergence—or not—of dialogic interaction at my research site. In one sense, I am courting something akin to what Isaacs (1999) has architecturally termed “the container” for dialogue. This container requires four conditions, namely the “active experience of people listening, respecting one another, suspending their judgments, and speaking their own voice” (p. 242). There is, however, an overarching and multifaceted difference I would point out between Isaacs’s “container” and the “dialogic situation” I seek to tease out in this chapter. The “container” of which Isaacs writes has, as its defining purpose, the fostering of dialogue, *per se*. In particular, he means dialogue as defined by the so-called East Coast perspective, as Pearce and Pearce (2000) have characterized it. This expressly functional approach to dialogue, also characterized by the Pearces (2000) and others as the “MIT Project,” is largely derived from the work of David Bohm (e.g., Bohm, 1990) and indeed presents a technical orientation to dialogue: dialogue as well executed and effective.

Thusly, Isaacs's container invokes recognition of invisible "fields" (think of the *mood* of a room) that can constrain or allow for dialogue, which will be seen, if it develops, as a lot of effortless talk flowing together, just like the frictionless flow of electrons in a superconductor, Isaacs explains, recalling Bohm, to thereby produce innovative and effective possibilities and solutions. Further, this scientific, or at least *functional* view of dialogue tends to prevail in contexts of "dialogue training" in organizations (Black, 2005), where concepts of reliability and measurability are prized, if at the expense of the richness otherwise available through the constitutive lens into organizational doings. The training arena requires concrete objectives and outcomes, and the East Coast School obliges, with relatively clear-cut prescriptions and even metrics. Clearly, then, Isaacs's "container" orients to a special (and, therefore, limited) understanding of dialogue, itself: it is narrowly purposeful, expressly aimed at the achievement of "*a* dialogue"—as in the sense of "we are convened to participate in a dialogue" (the noun usage, as explicated in this study's review of the literature, in Chapter 2).

In contrast, and central to the analysis of the faculty-training event under examination, the participants in the present study are *not* gathered expressly to "have a dialogue." They are, rather, convened (under various motivations, as revealed and discussed during participant interviews) to learn about curriculum development, through a training program designed to structurally and thematically emulate a college course, for the purpose of learning about course-redesign through curricular improvements that are informed through the application of learning theory and through innovations in the use of technology—especially that, as things work out. Dialogue is not the *purpose* of this

event, so dialogue may, therefore, emerge within, or even shape, a variety of prospective *containers*, including some that may take a markedly different form from the four-part, low-friction container that Isaacs propounds, where a harmonious and productive dialogue is the goal.

Thus we need a different conceptualization of the *situation* for dialogue, because, in this study, dialogue, itself, is not the goal of the participants; it is rather a discursive resource: a potentially fertile process for the achievement of varying and variable educational and social goals. Therefore, in the analysis to follow, dialogue may or may not flow in some superconducted coolness, nor will it necessarily require a harmonious tone. Instead, owing to a perspective of dialogue centered upon the engagement of difference, I seek not a generalized container for harmony, rather a better understanding of the interplay of harmony and discord in educational settings, more at Paulo Freire's (1998) ideal, which opens space for "the possibility of true dialogue, in which subjects in dialogue grow and learn by confronting their differences" (p. 59). And I am not purporting to determine and argue for all of the possible variables that may comprise the dialogic situation; rather I am looking for clues into salient aspects of this situational arena (in this case, faculty development training). In the words of Emanuel Schegloff (1991/2006), the key lies in analytic discovery:

One or more aspects of who the parties are and where, when they are talking may be indispensably relevant for producing and grasping the talk, but these are not decisively knowable a priori. It is not for us to *know* what about context is crucial, but to *discover* it. (p. 96)

The Situation, as Ever-evolving Frame for the Making of Meaning

Before I can honor Schegloff's above quoted exhortation to not pre-know, but to *discover*, the situational variables that are crucial to the practice at hand, I will next present a rationale for analyzing *the situation, as framer of meaning*. I begin by paying homage to the foundational contribution of sociologist W. I. Thomas. According to Thomas's biographer, Lewis Coser (1977) Thomas's concept of "the definition of the situation" provided, in the 1920s and beyond, a foundation for fellow sociologists, such as George Herbert Mead, to mount a case for symbolic interactionism, against the foil of structuralist and, later, behaviorist views arising from early-century anthropology and psychology (Coser, 1977). Thomas asserted, through his early ideas of "situational analysis," that acts, events, statements, artifacts, and so on, which were already of interest to anthropologists and sociologists, required not only a cultural awareness for their interpretation, but awareness of situational variables, within the larger culture. Thomas did not downplay nor disavow the importance of larger social structures as shapers of situations-as-understood, a recognition that might lend a modicum of added heuristic value to my 35 years of history—social, cultural, and even academic—at the larger locale of my research, the university where I gathered my data.

The point is that societal-level beliefs inform many, if not all, local "situations" within that culture. As an example, Thomas offered (in Coser, 1977) that a given culture's belief in the fundamental power of witchcraft would color the interpretations of many events, including meteorological, and might even be used to help explain other events in everyday interaction, such as the mysterious re-appearance of a lost object. In this way, societal beliefs inform situational interactions. But there are additional elements, as will next be discussed, that comprise a situation's meaningfulness for

participants—local elements that can compete with (whether complementing or contradicting) larger-scaled, or “macro-level,” values or beliefs. It is actually the interplay of these societal and local forces to which Thomas calls attention, through his much-cited theorem.

Thomas’s view continues to inform, at the core, current modes of discourse-oriented analysis of situations, even as current modes of such analysis—prominently Adele Clarke’s (2003, 2005) grounded-theory method she calls “situational analysis”—are seen to take postmodern turns, from their positivistic origins toward those highlighting complexity, ambiguity and the process of creating truth (Mathar, 2008). Indeed, as such methods evolve in postmodern sensitivities, they bear out the view of Thomas, according to his devotee (Coser, 1977), who proposed, as “the most pregnant sentence that Thomas ever wrote,” Thomas’s corollary to his theorem: “If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (p. 520).

Hence, interpretations of situations have pragmatic effects. As we see the situation, we frame the meaning, within, and then make choices as to our actions and responses. Here follows a pedagogically relevant example, one hinging on the power-full dilemma above presented. I offer this hypothetical case to show the effects of “the situation,” at both broader, and the more local, levels of meaning construction and its concomitant effects on communicative action, within settings of teaching and learning.

Consider a case wherein university administrators (or perhaps politicians) publicly call for a “war on grade inflation.” It would seem reasonable to expect that the students would hear of this “war” from time to time and fear its effects. Under this larger situation, the students might, in that fear, keep their mouths shut should they disagree

with something that the teacher has said. The students do not want to fall victim of the instructor's need to look for opportunities to suppress grades, so they suppress such commentary as might bring instructor disapproval. At a local level, say, a given class within that larger structure—surely, all classrooms will not be equally administered—even under the widely avowed “war on grade inflation,” it might be the case that students come to realize that a certain teacher prizes and rewards the open sharing of “contrary” views. Despite the larger framework (“watch your mouth or jeopardized your grade”), students in their local culture of “controversy is rewarded” might turn away, in class, from the security of lowered heads and the safety of their laptops. They might still feel the “societal” pressure of the war on grade inflation; that does not go away. But the hedge would be to make a point to speak out, since that is what (ostensibly) will be rewarded. They are not only unafraid of retribution, they are pressed to offer up contrary commentary, when available and pressing, especially.

What I'm trying to show by this example is that, at multiple levels, the *situation* frames not just how people will understand things, but, in parallel, it impacts, in case-specific and varying ways, what they will (or will not) do within a situation, as experienced and understood. As Coser (1977) explains, characterizing what he sees as Thomas's central contribution (if not his most pregnant sentence) to social theory and methodology, “Unless analysts attend to these subjective meanings, these definitions of the situation, they will be as unable to understand fellow human beings as they will be incapable of understanding other cultures” (p. 521).

I invoke Coser's overview of Thomas's contribution as a starting point for analysis of the data gathered and also as support my self-asserted “heuristic edge,” that of

some 26 consecutive years of teaching and other experience in academic settings, generally, and a span of almost 35 years' history with this research location. In other words, my history of familiarity with academic settings in "general" and with this university, in particular, overarches a robust "special" familiarity, as gained by my close participation in the event I videorecorded, including inclusion in planning sessions before the fact and extensive follow-up interactions after the fact. The following analysis, as is true of any discourse analytic techniques, draws upon interpretation, and such interpretation benefits from both general and special understandings of the "situated" data under examination.

As I have argued above, in order to understand the dilemmas, pragmatics and associated moves and functions of *dialogue in teaching and learning*, the analyst must first work to understand the *situational implications* and constructions of dialogic process of meaning making, processes that are by-definition conflictual, owing to Buber; affirming of worth, owing to Rogers; discursive and inescapably interconnected, owing to Bakhtin; and potentially powerful, toward transformation and innovation, owing to Bohm, Deetz, Isaacs, and many other proponents of dialogue. The literature supports my own instincts, and I affirm the importance of both, expressly toward satisfying the epistemological requirement of Clarke (2003), herself: that qualitative researchers not fail to acknowledge and account for their own subjectivity and position. Furthermore, since the analysis that follows involves interpreting and unpacking so-called *dialogue*, my starting point of familiarity *with* and even participation *in* the data constitutes a background that should fulfill the mandate articulated by Buber's ally and biographer, Maurice Friedman, who, when asked by Jeanine Czubaroff (Czubaroff & Friedman,

2000) “Are you saying that to do dialogue research you have to be engaged dialogically,” answered, “That’s right. Otherwise, you’ve lost it right at the onset” (p. 251).

Summary of Dialogue in Pedagogy and its Need for Communication Theory

Triadic dialogue, the standard fare in pedagogy, takes three known and simple turns. Other perspectives, including those from adult-ed literatures, are not so restrictive, yet they still feature a goal of closure, of lesson learned, perhaps via constructivist methods. In contrast, the practice of dialogue that I hope to flesh out and inform via methods of discourse analysis will both allow for a sense of closure, sometimes, and yet not insist upon that, in respect for a deeper commitment to balancing power relations.

All in all, I hope to reveal an *anatomy of dialogue* that draws closer to Burbules’s (1993) “repertoire,” yet one that maintains an openness to possibilities of unresolved discrepancy. In other words, I respect but do not require Barrera and Kramer’s (2009) “harmonizing,” in which contradiction is, in the end, “miraculously” (p. 71) resolved by way of an ever-present (if hiding) “third choice” (p. 46) that would bring such resolution, if only the parties will open to it. Following Ellsworth (1997), I hold that *resolution* is not necessarily an essential component of dialogue in teaching and learning, as is generally presumed in literatures of pedagogy. It is therefore time to explore ideas of dialogue through the deeper and multi-vocal perspectives, those not expressly germane to education, rather, those considered by theorists of communication.

Roots of Dialogue as Conceptualized in Literatures that Inform Communication Theory

Prominent developments in dialogue theory, if absent in pedagogy literatures, have indeed gained great momentum in communication literatures, especially in the past 25 years. Although, even as Cissna and Anderson (1998) wrote that “Dialogic scholarship

is now so extensive that it is no longer possible to review it comprehensively yet briefly” (p. 65), I propose to characterize this growth as owing to three major influences. For one, interest has mushroomed around the discovery of Mikhail Bakhtin’s (e.g., 1981; 1986) dialogue-centered literary theory and its application to modern scholarship in communication, a move championed by Leslie Baxter and colleagues (e.g., Baxter 2004; Baxter & Montgomery, 1996). The second factor propagating the growth of dialogue in communication studies is the robust, *polyvocal* (as Bakhtin might say) analysis that has developed around the 1957 public meeting of Martin Buber and Carl Rogers. As will be later detailed, scholars Rob Arnett, John Stewart, and, especially, the team of Rob Cissna and Ken Anderson, have led considerable scholarly interest and attention regarding the similarities and differences between the *dialogue* of Buber and that of Rogers, as may be seen and argued for from transcripts of this tape recorded meeting. A third major influence in the development of dialogic theory has been the productive fieldwork arising out of major public dialogue programs on both US coasts: on the East Coast, with what is known as the MIT project, which draws on the work of physicist David Bohm (1990) and features the work of Isaacs (1999); and on the West Coast, with the still-vibrant Public Dialogue Consortium begun in the mid 1980s, by W. Barnett Pearce and Stephen Littlejohn (Pearce & Pearce, 2004).

Modern Understandings of Dialogue in Communication Theory

With the major developments acknowledged, let us back up to a reasonable starting point for the communicational study of dialogue. This start arguably came in 1971 with the publication of Richard Johannesen’s article, “The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue,” in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. Drawing heavily upon

Buber's *Between Man and Man* (1947/1955) and the above mentioned *I and Thou* (1958) and aided in analysis by Buberian scholar (and Buber-Rogers moderator) Maurice Friedman, Johannesen could scarcely have imagined the floodgates he opened with his *QJS* breakthrough, which proposed its purpose as "to provide groundwork for further investigation of the concept of communication as dialogue" (1971, p. 373). Soon thereafter, John Poulakos (1974), a doctoral student at the University of Kansas at the time, followed up with a provocative article in *Western Speech* in which he strove to name the "components of dialogue," since Johannesen's earlier-named "components," he argued, using a Webster's dictionary to prove his point (!), were actually more like "characteristics" (p. 199). Promptly citing Buber's *Between Man and Man*, Poulakos re-named the components of dialogue Self, Other, and the "Between," evidently eschewing Webster in explaining that it is the first two that, together, "possibilitate" (p. 207) the third.

Stewart (1973; 1978) also deserves note as a founding father (and long-continuing contributor) of modern dialogue theory. Stewart, too, picked up Johannesen's train of thinking (1978), again in *QJS*, furthering the development by proposing four "distinguishing characteristics" of dialogue theory, namely (1) communication viewed as "transaction"; (2) research and education in dialogue as best served by an approach of "experientialism" (emphasizing the importance of the researcher's or student's *participation* in dialogue, for understanding, which foreshadowed much that we value in present-day interpretivistic qualitative research methods (c.f., Lindlof & Taylor, 2002); (3) a focus on "self and subjectivity," by which he refers to what Craig and Tracy (Craig, 1999, 2005, 2006; Craig & Tracy, 1995, 2010) consider as crucial to the theory-practice

link, this being reflection, particularly on experience and identity as constructed in interaction and discourse; and (4) the concept of “holism,” a view well explored more recently by Shotter (2000), which requires, in Stewart’s essay, a multitude of perspectives by which to honor, as researcher, “The Law of the Total Situation” (1978, p. 185). Stewart’s work (which had highlighted Buber’s importance as early as his renowned 1973 textbook, *Bridges not Walls*), moved into the 1980s with further developments in empathic/“interpretive” listening, then making the jump into “dialogic listening” in later editions of his textbook (1986).

Meanwhile, W. Barnett Pearce and Vernon Cronin (1979) had begun collaborating toward what would become their Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) theory, which intersected with ongoing developments in dialogue theory, showing the interplay of narratives, in interaction, toward the negotiation and maintenance of identities and meaning, and they further offered early methodologies for investigating dialogic conversation (Pearce, Cronen, & Conklin, 1979). Also around this time, Arnett (1982) had begun exploring the Buber-Rogers dialogue, some 25 years after the fact of their momentous meeting. Interestingly, Arnett’s early article named this meeting the “*Rogers-Buber*” dialogue, in contrast to the presently used name, the *Buber-Rogers* dialogue (Cissna & Anderson, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2004).

As of 1990, Cissna and Anderson, themselves, were still focused more on Rogers (c.f., 1957/1984) than on Buber in their work, with Rogers’s dialogue with Buber more a side note to their examination of Rogers’s (1990) emerging “praxis of dialogue,” except where this praxis centered on the connection of Rogers’s “positive regard” or “congruence” to Buber’s idea of “confirmation.” While the two sets of terminologies

present difficulties in clear differentiation, partly due to their differing uses of the key idea of “acceptance” (p. 136), we do find in the essay the seeds of Cissna and Anderson’s movement, away from Roger’s stance, that the therapist’s openness extends to an essential and healing commonality with the client, toward Buber’s stance, that this “meeting” is not one of commonality or congruence, but of *difference*, met and engaged.

Once Cissna and Anderson attended more closely to the actual recording and corrected the flawed original transcript, re-interpreting it for their 1994 volume, it became clearer to them, and to many analysts to follow, that great and untapped material for theoretical advancement lies in Buber, especially. Especially fertile was Buber’s idea of the “meeting” (featuring an open self but also an impenetrable boundary of self, of difference, this boundary defining, at both selves, Buber’s much discussed “in between” (Baxter, 2004; Cissna & Anderson, 1994; Poulakos, 1974; Stewart, Zediker, & Black, 2004). Still, Buber, to better clarify his *meeting*, needed Rogers, which was exactly Buber’s own point. For productive practical dialogue, we *need* to both meet at, and acknowledge, the great divide—the narrow ridge—that both separates and enjoins selves. Thereby, it helps that we value *difference* (more so than common ground) in scholarly dialogic circles today (Anderson, Baxter, & Cissna, 2004; Heath, et al., 2006).

Dialogue: Noun or Verb (or *Imperative!*)?

As an important definitional note, I must point out that to uncover a pragmatic and time-anchored conception of dialogue requires the use of both the *noun* form (dialogue as discourse event) and the *verb* form (dialogue as process) of this much-praised, sometimes-bashed and usually over-generalized communication concept. Stewart and Zediker (2000), for example, repine what they see as ‘a broadening of the term to

encompass, in some books and articles, all human meaning-making” (p. 224). Dialogue is a broad concept, indeed, and even when we attempt to partition the subject, this noun-verb dichotomy fails to split the apple in a way that works for everyone.

For example, Hyde and Bineham (2000), writing in the special “Studies in Dialogue” double-issue of the *Southern Journal of Communication*, prefer the fundamental differentiation of Dialogue₁ and Dialogue₂. For these authors, Dialogue₁ is a “form of discourse” that is generally collaborative, a conception of dialogue they tie to Bohm’s “social intelligence.” It is information processing, akin to deliberation, yet with more openness than that terminology would, itself, necessitate. In contrast, their Dialogue₂, which they derive from Buber’s work, is a “relational space” that implies ontology: a “way of being with another person” (p. 212). Indeed this is an important differentiation between two polar understandings of dialogue, but the risk is to miss the dialectical tension between the poles; focused instead on the differentiation, we missed that dialogue is sustained fundamentally by both.

Yet another halving of the dialogic apple, among the seemingly boundless concepts of dialogue, appears in the *Southern Journal*’s very next article in that special edition on dialogue, wherein Stewart and Zediker (2000) fundamentally contrast “descriptive” versus “prescriptive” conceptualizations. For these authors, the apple is best split with Bakhtin on one side, his dialogism serving to describe and characterize all of human discourse, and Buber on the other, his dialogue an ideal to be strived for. Whereas this is a very different angle at which to pass the knife, while halving the apple, it is interesting to note the common element in both dichotomies is the ontology, the relational space, of Martin Buber.

In fact, beyond noun or verb, dialogue can also be considered, at its core, as *adverb*, that is, as characteristic of action that unfolds *dialogically*. Such is a point, again rooted at least partially in Buber, pressed by Barnett Pearce (2002), writing in the foreword of Cissna and Anderson's influential re-transcription and re-examination of the Buber-Rogers debate. Pearce asserts his preference of *dialogically* over the noun *dialogue*, explaining, "This usage signals a conceptualization of dialogue as a quality with which we perform the whole gamut of speech acts that comprise social life" (p. ix).

I mean, in presenting these varying grammatical terminologies, to acknowledge that when one theorizes about "dialogue" at all, one must acknowledge the different sides available in the discussion—and even aware of the different discussions available within "sides." In the present analysis, I commit to a response of "all of the above," toward illuminating the practical variables that that may foster dialogue in teaching and learning. Indeed, we will, in the analytic chapters, come face to face with yet additional grammatical roles, such as the *imperative*: "Now, Dialogue!"

Grounding Dialogic Theory's Deeper Roots in Interpretation and Identification

With relevant dialogic history and theory surveyed, and dialogue, itself, established, for present purposes, as both product and process, let us move deeper into theory so as to solidify the conceptual core of an expressly practical dialogue. This core, following Gadamer's (1960/1975) program of hermeneutics, we can think of as *interpretation*—the center of human existence, the subjective meaningfulness of experience, wherein the devil can, presto-chango, become an angel, through tricks of naming, as we may choose. Burke's (1961) "Epilogue: Prologue in Hell," which concludes his *Rhetoric of Religion*, comes quickly to mind. In Burke's book-ending

“dialogue” (not dialogue as discursive foundation; not dialogue as ontological ideal, but, this time, dialogue expressly as literary genre: not exposition, not narrative, but simply literary characters in conversation), God and Satan confer as to the expected benefits and risks of giving to Man the gift (and curse) of language. Burke’s lifework-summing point (and the essence of his late-named *logology*) is that the gift/curse of language allows us to interpret anything and everything as good or evil, and we make these choices in ways that serve to purify us (as we align our identities with what we call good and make good shows of despising what we label as evil). This purification serves to purge the guilt invoked by the prominence of “perfect” linguistic possibilities (ideals we can name) that infinitely exceed what our human capabilities can ever achieve. We can *talk about* perfection, but we can never *be* perfect, and it bugs the hell out of us (Burke might say “into us”).

True, it is Richard Weaver who named the rhetorical constructs of “god terms” and “devil terms” (Larson, 2007, p. 129), but it is Burke (1945/1969) who first clarified our desperate need for these polar landmarks, for processes of clearly defined *identification*. Relatedly, we see ample room, in the work of conversation analysis (CA) pioneer Harvey Sacks (1966/2006) and followers, for proper respect paid to Burke, for identifying the sub-stance (shared standpoint) of what are called in discourse studies “membership categories.” Suffice to say that this important basis for identity formation in conversation (recall Pearce and Cronin’s interactive CMM) and related identity analysis (in CA and other modes of discourse analysis) was seeded by Burke’s “paradox of substance” (1945/1969, p. 21), which might be summarized thusly: where (hence with whom) I stand is *who* I am, at my *sub-stantive* core, even though, paradoxically, this

“located” *ground* I’m standing on is *not* me, but necessarily *apart* from me, in fact, “under” me, hence serving as my *sub*-stance. Thus, Sacks’ construct of “*category*”—with whom I am presumed (by others, in their references to me) to stand—is but another name, to Burke, for *where* I presumably stand. I can “stand” in infancy; I can “stand” in motherhood. For that matter, I can stand in “Dixie” (as Burke famously wrote, by way of example), depending on the context in which I am locating my identity. For a practical dialogue, we are intensely concerned with “where one stands” and why, as this ultimately locates the “in between”—the paradoxical wall where one’s *Self* will meet *Other*. Location, location, location. Where we stand controls where any “meeting” can take place. Where we stand dictates where we locate our “narrow ridge” and, for that matter, *when* we locate it. Place and time are two elements of practical dialogue’s dramatic “setting” that cannot be overvalued. Burke knew about the scene, and we should not overlook his insight, as further identify and sub-stantiate a practical classroom dialogue.

Enter Bakhtin and Critical Factors of Time and Space

The ongoing process of Man’s linguistic identity formation, though bound in history and tradition, is, alas, never complete. That is, the sun never quite sets on “Naming-day in Eden,” as Jacobs (1958/1969) suggests, noting in his preface that the “inexhaustible voice reverberating down the ages is the bond of solidarity which unites us in one continuous humanity” (p. xvii). With interpretation and its pragmatic partner, identification, founding the core of practical dialogue, we move on for a better look at just how our facility for both moves, and moves us, through time, as we move outward from our model’s core to its outer layers of dialogic meeting and meaning.

If Bakhtin's *heteroglossia* is the language, and his *carnival* the occasion (Baxter, 2004), it is his *chronotope* that serves as dialogue's setting, the time and place, united and eternal: a setting, in a moment but connected to all moments, for the meeting of selves, in talk. Bakhtin's (1981, first appearing in 1937) idea of the *chronotope* can be easily confused, notes Bakhtinian scholar and anthologist Pam Morris (1994), for Kantian generalizations about a trans-historical span of view: the big picture. For Bakhtin, the trans-historicity of language—interconnected speech, across time, across place, across situations, and even across speech communities (significantly, the roots of his *heteroglossia* derive from his own multilingual upbringing, states biographer Bonetskaia, 2004)—is not so much “the big picture” as it is the *little* picture: the vortex of transhistorical linguistic forces funneling to the moment, for present purposes, to the moment of *dialogue*.

Bakhtin's Chronotope Meets Cissna and Anderson's Dialogic Moment

This chronotopic “moment” of dialogue, we must note, differs markedly from Cissna and Anderson's (1998) important and oft cited “dialogic moment,” which is a special, spontaneous and unpredictable peak of mutual experience (see also Goodall, Jr. & Kellett, 2004) between interlocutors, a co-created and authentic, if momentary, meeting of selves—a lucky flash of complete connection that happens at the “the between.” Cissna and Anderson's (1998) dialogic moment can never be assured and certainly never forced, though it can be nurtured into greater possibility. For these authors, though, the point of naming the “moment” turns on its power to explain the difficulties of dialogue as a theorized fragment of Utopia. They use their “momentary” focus as a connection to postmodern sensitivities, to help escort dialogism into the

postmodern discussion. A side benefit of Cissna and Anderson's (1998) essay is the highlighting of listening, in both Buber and Rogers, especially Rogers's use of empathic, dialogic listening "to provide a relationship for each client—not a sounding board or reflecting pool, not a blank slate or a mirror" (p. 93). Clearly they acknowledge, through this listening emphasis and elsewhere, that the richness of dialogic *process* holds important value, even apart from the special attainment of the dialogic *moment*, yet their "momentary" frame does minimize, in a sense, the dialogic process outside of the moment of dialogue, itself.

In contrast, Bakhtin's chronotopic moment is the everyday and inescapable product of timeless intertextuality, a constant flow of discursive moments, each produced by the full effects of the whole of history and tradition. Hence, for Bakhtin (1986), "The sentence, like the word, has no author. Like the word, it belongs to nobody . . . any utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication" (pp. 83-84). Dialogue, for Bakhtin, is an ongoing event, but he also emphasized that the partner of time, in the chronotope, is place—in fact Bakhtin (1981) defines chronotope as "literally, 'time-space'" (p. 85), linking this idea to Einstein's theory of relativity, then turning his attention back to literary applications:

In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot, and history. (p. 85)

If we are going to follow Baxter's rich analysis of Bakhtin's dialogism as an explanation and empowerment of enlightened human interaction, we will have to account

for something beyond “the moment” of dialogue; the chronotope holds all moments—and all places—as they bear upon the discourse produced by selves.

Dialogue as Public Remedy? . . . or as Covert Mechanism of Control

The third major strand in the braid of pragmatically-relevant dialogic theory has been the productive fieldwork arising out of major public dialogue programs on both US coasts, among other locales. On the East Coast, the so-called MIT project draws on the work of physicist/dialogist David Bohm (1990, 2004), aided by the popularizing work of Isaacs (1999), whose expressly business-oriented approach to dialogue “and the art of thinking together” pays homage to his mentors, such as Argyris, Schein, and Senge (1999). Germane, perhaps, to its Cambridge roots, the MIT projects seeks, in the well heeled “dialogues” it conducts, to “harness” the “collective intelligence” (Issacs, 1999, p. 11) available within a given group, and Bohm (1990), especially, argues for the benefits of a full, robust group of participants, if “a dialogue” there would be.

On the West Coast, dialogue-as-public-entity is notably promulgated by the still-vibrant Public Dialogue Consortium begun in the mid 1980s by W. Barnett Pearce and Stephen Littlejohn (Pearce & Pearce, 2004). Also westward (from present perch), Leonard Hawes (2002) has brought public dialogue to bear on the secular-nonsecular tensions in Utah, deriving from his work a number of practical strategies by which third parties can intervene against Bateson’s “double-bind,” which Hawes characterizes, for dialogic purposes, as a cyclical trap of mutual blaming among parties in conflict. Here, again, is the sense of dialogue as something facilitated by a specialist; for Hawes, the specialist is the third voice in a “three-cornered narrative” (p. 184).

Further toward my goal of unpacking pragmatic components of dialogue, I would point out that Pearce and Pearce (2000) likewise speak of their being led, by experience, to a “hypothesis that facilitating public dialogue requires the ability to maintain a three-sided or three-leveled *charmed loop* [emphasis added] among stories of self, of relationship, and of episode” (p. 173). These congruous conceptions show dialogue as comprised of “essential components”—the very task of this essay—but the universal sense of dialogue I wish to illuminate transcends the context-limiting idea that “a dialogue” is something that a specialist comes in and “does” for distressed and needy clients; rather I seek the dialogue that occurs, or can occur, in everyday forms of conversation, in and out of the organizational and community settings but, especially, in this study, spontaneous occurrences in formalized teaching and learning.

Another caution I make regarding “the dialogic episode” as facilitated in the public/organizational sphere requires the invocation of critical theory. What if Self (who may lack power) still feels “unheard,” while Other (ostensibly holding power) is off throwing a “We-Had-Dialogue” party? This question is central to the concerns of critical theorists, such as Deetz and Simpson (2004), Heath et al. (2006), and Weirzbieka (2006), who fear that “common ground”—the utopia of public understandings of (and training in) dialogue—is but an excuse for the powerful party to co-opt the weaker. When the weaker comes to “get on the same page” as the stronger (who has relocated to the place of “common ground”), have the parties really “reached dialogue”? In any case, they had better reach dialogue expediently, in the public dialogue sense, since, *pragmatically*, the stakeholders have limited “time-space” that has been booked, paid for, and facilitated.

Dialogue: “Magical Moment” . . . or Practical Tool

The literature reviewed above is presented as acknowledgement that when one argues for new developments in dialogue theory, one must be aware of the different literatures involved, aware of the different sides available in the debate, and even aware of the different debates available. Craig (2007) has aided us in this move toward a practical approach to dialogic theory, through his ongoing exploration of dialogue as the term is used in the public vernacular. His recent study provides an exploratory look at approximately 50 public uses and associated understandings of the term, as garnered from a variety of commonplace media. Importantly, in this exploration of the everyday uses and understandings of dialogue, he finds that a theoretical “tension” that “has been much discussed by theorists of dialogue” is tellingly absent from the everyday public discourse samples he gathered and studied, namely the customary scholarly tension “between dialogue and technique” (p. 10). Here he is refuting the beliefs of Buberian scholars such as Cissna and Anderson (2002), who assert that the essence of dialogue is momentary, almost magical, and cannot be attained through “technique” (as may have been learned, say, at Pearce’s PDC).

As I move from this review of relevant literature about the discursive mode, dialogue, to relevant literature about prospective methods for its study, I wish to clarify that it is the practical dialogue, not the magical, that I hope to uncover. I have canvassed above quite a disparity among views, definitions, and conceptualizations of dialogue. Craig (2007) confirms the inherent challenge of this enterprise, writing that dialogue theory, itself, “is not a unified theory but rather a complex field of thought comprising various theoretical approaches” (p. 9). Broadening the scope of this already problematically wide-spanning term, Wierzbicka’s (2006) view provides a global

perspective in her cross-linguistic examination of the term, *dialogue*, concluding that this important and highly valued (if misunderstood) concept may, in fact, require, for analysis, more than one language—or perhaps a new language altogether:

Above all, ‘dialogue’ requires an effort to make ourselves understood as well as try to understand, and here, the [researcher’s] “right” attitudes, motivations, and so on will not suffice. . . A search for mutual understanding may require a search for a new language, intelligible to all partners. The use of English as a global lingual franca may not be sufficient for these purposes. (p. 700)

But are her assumptions correct? Particularly, are *understanding* and *being understood* truly the “above-all” concerns of dialogue, given its many definitions and functions? And do the confines of our English language (or any single language) truly shackle any meaningful, new understanding of dialogue, in practice? Through this study, I hope to make a productive start toward an improved understanding of *dialogue*, particularly in the classroom context, while satisfying Wierzbicka and others who hold critical and cross-cultural concerns such as Carbaugh (2005), regarding dialogic study.

There may be a seductively mysterious quality in Cissna and Anderson’s “magical” moment of dialogue, this supported by Wierzbicka’s skepticism regarding any dialogic analysis, but there is also a pragmatic impotence to considering dialogue in the classroom setting (or anywhere) as but a magical moment. Practical pedagogy, like practical communication theory, requires concepts and practices that do not hinge on the whims of fate, as might be said for the recent findings of McCaw (2008), who built a link between teachable moments and dialogic moments through survey research that queried, in separate surveys, 15 school teachers and 5 dialogue theorists (all of whom are cited in

this study). Whereas the teachers were more inclined to define the teachable moment as unpredictable and marked by surprise, the five theorists were, like I am, more inclined to downplay the “mystical” element, noting that, even while the peaks of dialogic experience in their classes do surely arise in moments of unanticipated surprise, these peaks require preparation and cultivation. Hence, while I guard against a too-casual use of the idea of “magic” in characterizing the dialogic moment, I yet want to show dialogue as existing, importantly, before, during, and after these at-least *special* and ostensibly rare moments. To use a metaphor I have found useful in collaborative discussion, a metaphor that Wayne Brockreide (1976), who wrote of “arguers as lovers,” might especially appreciate, I might offer that I am after the love-making, not just the climax.

Seeking the Space Where Conflicting Stories Live Together—to Make New Stories

The following passage, from an article by scholar and educator Kimberly Pearce (2004), serves to set the theme for the presentation of my research question

To practice cosmopolitan communication, it is essential that I stay in the tension of these contradictory stories, by not attempting to fix, change, or minimize any or all of them. So, the first step was to enlarge my own perspective so as to create a frame that would enable these conflicting stories to live together. (p. 85)

Through my study, I wish to develop a frame much like that of Pearce’s classroom aspiration, one that “enables conflicting stories to live together,” productively. Thusly, it is not individual utterances that most interest me, but dialogic ones, multivocal products of engaged interaction. I do not wish to study how one story creates, or

otherwise make space for, another story, though this itself is a process likely fascinating to those interested in discourse.

Just as the matchstick, for the sparking of fire needs the slate, and vice versa, teachers and learners need each other. But what I want to investigate is *not* how one incendiary entity necessitates another; rather, I seek to better understand what happens when the two materials rub together as one. That is, I wish to analyze the co-creation of the emergent story, the one made possible through the enjoining of perspectives, of voices. I seek, via methods of ethnographically informed—indeed, dialogic—discourse analysis, to uncover the instigation, the sparks, of classroom dialogue and to track the moves that follow to fan the sparks into combustion. Further I aim to uncover the discursive processes and sequences that, following combustion, proceed to kindle the delicate flame into a classroom fire that cooks.

Research Question

In league with Pearce, my focus, in the main, is not to find a way to give rise to the suppressed story or the oppressed voice. Instead, I look to identify and theorize the place where multiple voices, voices of difference, do not bypass one another in the name of politeness, but engage, whether harmoniously or discordantly, and, in doing so, co-create a product only possible through this engagement—though the preference in classroom discourse, as indicated in my review of pedagogical literature, is typically skewed toward convergence, agreement, and timely progress toward pre-configured ends. Like Deetz (1992) I wish to reclaim conflict and the “possible positivity of power” (p. 170) that even Habermas’s *ideal speech situation* is critiqued as bypassing. In sum, I seek to understand the processes of classroom dialogue that do not simply “reach the learning

goal,” but that invigorate, instead, a sense that the learning never ends—that the fire can, with the right care and fuel, burn without end. With the “Eternal Fire” metaphor abiding, I present my research question:

What are the facilitative and constitutive elements of dialogue in teaching and learning, the discursive openings and animations, the moves and interactional patterns that maintain engagement, and, the various outcomes that arise, as seen momentarily and over time, in the environment of faculty training? What are the key situational variables, as indicated especially in challenging moments of interactional trouble, and what are the interactional moves—even stages—that warrant inclusion in a communication-anchored anatomy of “dialogue in teaching and learning,” toward development of a communication-rich pedagogy, centered upon difference and aimed directly at discursive authenticity, mutuality, openness, participation, innovation, and productivity?

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH SETTING AND EVENT: DISCURSIVE ARENA FOR ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I present a close look at the research site and event, the participants, and my role, as researcher-participant, before, during, and after the training. What interpretive research, such as this study, may lack in what empiricists would consider hard data, it gains by elevated standards of understanding: a premier hermeneutic basis is warranted, before presuming to consider and analyze the sensemaking implicit in the interactive discourse of others. As with most forms of discourse analysis, methods benefit in proportion to the researcher's ability and motivation to appreciate the world-view of the participants and the ways and nuances of their discourse. This chapter will demonstrate, through various narratives and texts, that the requirement of robust familiarity toward apt interpretation and analysis, is acceptably fulfilled in the present study.

Research Site

I gathered my data during the Spring 2007 semester (this I refer to as "Year 1") and again during the Spring 2008 semester ("Year 2"), at a large, western university, where a series of 12 weekly, two-hour curriculum-improvement training sessions (meetings) unfolded. These training sessions were attended by a select group of trainees, totaling about a dozen faculty, graduate students, and staff, in Year 1, and roughly 7-10 such participants, including many of the same participants, in Year 2. For reasons I will soon explain, I am restricting the bulk of my analysis to events that unfolded during the

Year 1 training series. In this chapter, I will present a detailed overview of this site for data gathering, including details about the training session itself, in terms of both curriculum and central discursive features of the semester-long event. Through this chapter's closer examination of the site and of the nature of the discourse that transpired there, I aim to substantiate and support the necessary alignment of the four essential characteristics of this study: site, literature, method, and analysis.

In a simple view, then, the primary site of this research is Room 200 in the then-brand-new, technologically advanced "Center of Technology" (COT) building (all building and personal names are pseudonyms) at this large public university. Many millions of dollars were recently spent constructing and equipping this astoundingly high-tech building, even at a time of continual budget cutting over several years of steady, annual funding decreases by the state legislature. Clearly, technology is a priority on this campus, as the COT building both supports and symbolizes. Its grand opening, in fact, made for an upbeat news story on local network television. From the perspective of campus politics, things that go on in this building are of heightened significance. It cannot have hurt, in recruiting volunteers for this calendar-impacting, semester-long, several-hours-per-week project, to have the project located in the COT, arguably the new "high-rent district" across the whole university system in this state.

Believing this project as fertile ground for potentially productive dialogic discussion—and thereafter, my discursive analysis—I strived, well prior to the any of the actual Year 1 training sessions, to become involved with the project and was approved to participate by the person in charge, the university's Teaching Assistant Excellence (TAE) program director, Dr. Nora Porter, who designed and directed this training program.

Following my approval as researcher, I participated in roughly 6-7 hours of site- and project-oriented meetings and related communications, some in group settings and some one-on-one, with NP, the director.

The actual training meetings, once the project began, were planned and conducted in a form designed to emulate a college class. In both years, the series of sessions was orchestrated to serve one specific and overarching goal: that each attending faculty member (three faculty members in Year 1; one faculty member in Year 2) would learn and practice, as would be necessary for the actual re-development of the curriculum for a specific course selected by the faculty member. This high-profile training project received special funding from the university's Office of the Provost, including, for example, \$2,500 fellowships granted for graduate-assistants/aides to serve each participating faculty member, each assistant to be hand-selected by the participating faculty member.

In this study, I focus my analytic attention primarily upon the data gathered Year 1, though I gathered abundant data over both years of this twice-run training event. I am delimiting my data for analysis to Year 1 for reasons of analytic focus and to take full advantage of a number of especially provocative interactions that marked the discourse available in Year 1, during which time the course curriculum was fresh and untested and the participants included more than just one faculty member, a fact that turned out to be an important difference between the two years of the project, in terms of the richness of the data that emerged.

Pedagogical Interests Special to the Research Site

Toward validating my research site, I am compelled to satisfactorily address a central question briefly broached in Chapter 1. Given that much of the pedagogical concerns, interests and commitments discussed so far center on *classroom* activity, am I or am I not, at this research site, studying a *classroom*; that is, am I analyzing, at this site, discourse that bears both implication and application toward improving practice in the traditional classroom setting? Indeed, a substantial share of the literature reviewed for this study is oriented toward traditional “classroom” communication (especially K-12, where such study is most commonly conducted), so it might seem natural and appropriate that the data to be examined in this study should be gathered from such a traditional classroom setting, whether K-12 or, perhaps, undergraduate.

To respond to this concern, I would first note that, in terms of look—of external appearance—the site of this research can very reasonably be deemed a “classroom.” It is, in fact, referred to by participants (during sessions and in outside interviews) as “our classroom.” As noted above, and as will be seen in further screenshots embedded in the transcript, the movable tables were, each week, arranged in a classroom-typical U-shape, with the weekly presenter, ostensibly the week’s “teacher,” standing and presenting material front and center, in the opening of the U, to an array of “students.” Looks just like a classroom, so far.

From the standpoint of not just looks but of *practice*, these students, like those in most classrooms across this vast university, are regularly seen sitting in their places, listening and sometimes speaking, most often typing away at their laptops, taking notes and otherwise participating in educational activities (and/or surreptitiously checking e-mail or doing other work). It not only *looks* like a classroom, it houses people *doing what*

people do in a classroom. As the semester unfolded, I noticed more and more participants bringing in their own laptops, eschewing the loaner laptops available in the tech cabinet of this hi-tech classroom. Occasionally, I would use the powerful zoom-lens of the videocamera to peer at the screens of different viewable laptops, often to see quite a variety of outside work being done, though participants are presumed to working together on the same material. Now, we have not just a classroom, but an up-to-date classroom. Overall, one undeniably finds in the setting of this training project—a project that, by design, is intended to emulate a three-credit college class, as NP often reminds the group—the general look and feel of a typical classroom on this campus, except that some of the “students” are older than usual.

Indeed, this setting presents some important *differences* from traditional classrooms, too, differences that necessarily bear upon the discursive interaction to be analyzed. Central among these differences is that of unusual power dynamics among the participants. We find here a very different set of classroom “relations of power,” to use Foucault’s (1980; 1984/1994) well-worn concept, wherein power is not a commodity held by one party, but a complex of relations and engage all parties and require participation and even collaboration (witting or not) by all parties. The power relations typical of a college classroom, like those typical in K-12, grant authority to the teacher, with tacit cooperation from the students. Recall that we are looking for insights into dialogue in teaching and learning that hinge on the communication-theory orientation to dialogue that foregrounds the engagement of difference among interlocutors. In a traditional classroom, wherein students are awarded grades and, ostensibly, place a high value on these grades, it might be uncommon for a student to perceive the necessary

freedom needed to “demonstrate difference” in the classroom. To challenge the teacher is to risk one’s grade; to comply, outwardly at least, with teacher direction, while not guaranteeing a preferred grade, is likely to aid the cause—the cause of grading if not that of learning.

In marked contrast, our “classroom,” features “students” who are doing ungraded work and are otherwise participating in ways that will never be graded. Indeed there is a formal and very thorough (to some, tedious) evaluation designed into this program, but it is the students, not the teacher, who will deliver this assessment. These “students” (particularly the three faculty members, all full professors) are themselves of higher general status, within the university community, than are the staff-level presenters. According to statements made in their interviews (as will be discussed during data analysis), each faculty member is attending for personal purposes, partly out of curiosity, partly as a result of general university-wide pressure to improve understandings and uses of technology, and partly as a personal favor to the project director. As for the three university-funded graduate assistants who serve the three faculty members, they, as with all other participants, would not have a “grade” to worry about, should they find themselves considering making a possibly unwelcomed “demonstration of difference” during class. Actually, they have more at risk as underlings of the faculty they assist, including prominent institutional and career needs for written support (such as letters of recommendation). They need not please the teacher, but they had better please their faculty sponsors, seated, as “fellow classmates,” next to them.

And the rest of the “students” in this group, those who are neither faculty nor hand-picked graduate assistants, serve the university in the role of department-specific

technology assistants, tech experts who take turns, themselves, certain weeks, as that week's "teacher" in this faculty-development event. Yes, they have job-duty and related job-evaluation concerns, but unlike traditional students, the work they do in this course is performed not for grades, but for pay, in amounts that are not directly impacted by their in-class performance. No, none of these students is being directly graded, and this manifest fact, true for all participants except the teachers (!), clearly alters the context for discursive interaction, as opposed to traditional classrooms.

Especially in the sense of power relations, then, I grant—in fact, I celebrate—that the composition of the "students" and their relationships to the "teachers" combine for a unique classroom situation rather than a typical one. Also, there is the obvious fact that these students are not children, but adults—or at least young adults. When we draw from the literature of teaching and learning, toward uncovering theoretical and analytical constructs that will aid our analysis of "difference demonstrated" in the classroom, we find a distinct disconnect here. That is, as surveyed in Chapter 2, the research and related theoretical work being done, presently, and let us say for the past 20 years or so, as regards "discourse in teaching and learning" emanates almost exclusively from literatures regarding pedagogy in the K-12 arena. Therefore is from that literature that I must develop and anchor my theoretical commitments and methodology, despite the fact that my site, participants, and event itself, fall outside of the K-12 arena. Of course there is significant and multifaceted study underway, as regards adult learning in general, but for research and analysis centered upon discourse, specifically the discursive theorizing of dialogue in teaching and learning, it is the literature of K-12 pedagogy that holds closest relevance, discursively.

Consider, for example, Mary Manke's (1997) aforementioned book on classroom power relations, in which she devotes a whole chapter to "interactive contributions" (i.e., two-way, akin to interaction that is dialogic) within relations of power, a type of classroom interaction that she partitions off as having a distinct and noteworthy nature. Tellingly, Manke's chapter is titled "Students in Conflict with Teachers' Agendas: Interactive Contributions to Classroom Power Relations." Quite usefully, it would seem, to our present purposes, the exemplifying "interactive contributions" that Manke presents are cataloged under such headings as "student actions that conflict with teacher agendas" (p. 107), "student rejection of the teacher's assumptions" (p. 111), "students assuming rules that conflict with teacher expectations" (p. 113), and even "students assuming the role of the teacher" (p. 115).

However, when we look closely at the examples Manke presents, we encounter such transgressions as this: "a relatively radical action, one that many of the students never choose is simply to get up and move." An example she shows, from her observational data, plays out this way: "Lewis gets up and goes to the pencil sharpener / Ms. Bridgestone: No Lewis, not now. / Lewis turns back to his seat with a disgusted look" (p.110). In another example, a student signs up for an activity inappropriately, attempting to preempt the turn of another student by writing his name just above the place on the blackboard where the other student has properly signed up to go first. Authority-challenging moves, with childish accoutrement, such as these, differ significantly from what we would expect to find in our data, and are predominately nonverbal moves, at that. And yet, the parallels between Manke's classrooms and the educational arena that is the subject of my study, replete as mine is with adult learners—

in fact, tenured faculty as “students”—are more significant than one might expect. For example, in data analysis, I will present a close parallel, when one of the participants, Ike, rises from his seat and begins to make his way toward the door, and is told to stop in his tracks by the “teacher,” who is in the process of being challenged by another participant.

However, Manke also presents some transgressions of talk—the discursive type of “transgression” that we wish to examine—such as in the following example, involving a first-grader named Erin, who, seemingly mischievously, criticizes the teacher’s penmanship:

Ms. Kaminski, at Erin’s request, has written that date in Erin’s notebook.

Erin looks at it critically. / Erin: That’s not a very good 2. / Ms. Kaminski:

That’s the kind of 2 that came out, so that’s how it will have to be. (p. 114)

Similarities notwithstanding, examples such as these—that portray the contestation of relations of classroom power in existing pedagogical literature—differ markedly from the kinds of contestation one would expect to find in my learning setting, wherein some students (perhaps a better word is trainees, or even participants) are of higher institutional status than are the teachers, who, themselves, vary week to week. Furthermore, as noted above, a significant difference in my data, as compared to traditional classroom study, is that nobody, except the teachers/trainers, themselves, are being formally assessed; that is the “students” in my data set have no concern about prospective grades.

I argue, however, that these differences are strengths, not weaknesses, in this study. To wit, my communicational perspective on dialogue, one interested in demonstrations of difference, including challenges to authority (or, at least, challenges to

tradition), is not well served by traditional (K-12) examples, such as Manke's, in which first-graders are told to sit back down, and they do. Since my intention is to theorize *dialogue in teaching and learning*, I absolutely require a "classroom" where power relations are more balanced, such that the kind of dialogue I seek to explore is even possible. There is not a ready nor rich literature available as regards closely examined and well theorized discursive interaction in adult training and development. Yet that arena (adult education and/or professional development) is exactly the kind of the arena (since not complicated by traditional and prevalent grader-gradee power relations) wherein the dialogue I seek to identify and theorize is possible, wherein a demonstration of difference could (and does) play out more visibly and productively from that in the extant literature, wherein the student "demonstrating the difference" is simply told to sit back down, and does so (else being sent to the principal's office).

As we will observe in the analysis presented forthwith, teacher responses to the effect of Ms. Kaminski's "That's how it will have to be," when coming in the face of *adult*-made challenges to authority, will not wash, especially when the adults making the challenge are tenured faculty, participating in the "class" voluntarily, for their own reasons, risking no grade or other formal evaluation. Furthermore, it is both interesting and telling that, Manke, in asserting that "this chapter has deep roots in the work of Courtney Cazden" (p. 106), notes, in passing, that, like herself, Cazden—whom I've cited significantly in the review of the literature and who is cross-referenced in the work of other prominent authorities—gained her first-hand classroom experience, the foundation, in practice, to her scholarly work, as a teacher of first grade.

I make this point both as a caveat and, obviously, as a claim to special interest, as regards the legitimacy of the “classroom” of my own investigation. The scholar seeking insight into “student actions that conflict with teacher agendas,” will come away from traditional pedagogy literatures unenlightened, except in the ways and means by which one might cajole juveniles back into their seats.

No, the classroom I am studying is not, in the sense of comparable analysis of “discourse in educational settings,” the same kind of classroom one would customarily—almost exclusively—encounter in related pedagogical research literature. This characteristic of my research setting not only constitutes a viable connection between my research question and my data, it distinguishes my work as essentially different from that available in prior studies. Since I seek to understand processes of “the engagement of difference” as the central communicational component of *classroom dialogue*, I must do so at a site that is—and essentially so—contrary to the types of classrooms normally researched, of which there are thousands upon thousands available for less fruitful study. Only at such a site as is this very special classroom can we readily examine, among other *dialogic* possibilities, protracted, unaborted (indeed, successful) challenges to classroom authority, an almost-mythical discursive creature within the classroom setting, wherein students fear speaking out, whether because of the possibilities of grade retribution—or, for the younger student, fears of being sent to the principal’s office, to wretch and tremble while the parents are notified of their child’s “unacceptable choices made during class.” Only at such a site as this, can we, indeed, study how this provocative discourse, if rare in educational settings, looks, unfolds, and functions, so that we may better understand its nature and possibility, to ultimately consider the ways and means by which

such a discursive unicorn—*classroom demonstrations of difference*—might be productively imported, from our special site into, ultimately, the traditional classroom, where it is presently unavailable, in neither the literature nor in the actual classroom, due to the customary classroom relations of power delineated above (grades, etc.).

Research *Scene*: Into the Vaunted “Center of Technology” Building, We Venture

In qualitative research, with its mandates of participant and contextual familiarity, the prospective researcher must narrow, in conceptualizing the context of the communicative action to be analyzed, from *site* to *scene* (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Furthermore, I would note that sporadic references throughout this dissertation to the work of Kenneth Burke and also Erving Goffman should indicate both a sensitivity to and appreciation for such a foundational characterization of the *drama* inherent in the research “scene,” as such. For Lindlof and Taylor, the *scene* “refers to actors’ self-defined scope of social action” (p. 79). To gain necessary *scenic* understandings, then, an early step toward the eventual development of scholarly claims from qualitative data, the authors advocate “casing” the scene. Let us proceed to do precisely that.

It is Wednesday morning, just before nine o’clock. The weekly, two-hour ritual will soon begin. Approaching the COT entryway, a fancy flagstone porch of sorts that is recessed under the overhanging second floor, we pass under a huge, exterior video screen near the impressive doorways, noting, upon entering the building, the high-tech mood of the lobby, where two more video screens (actually walls) display, without sound, larger-than-life scenes from video projects created by students in the production facility on the third floor, the highest full floor of the COT. Walking across the expansive foyer, we notice that an elevator is available, but most of the youthful foot traffic hustles and

bustles its way upward via the stylish and open stairway, some having first stopped for a cup of coffee at “Ric’s Cafe” in a nook off to one side the lobby.

Once upstairs, we make our way to Room 200, passing further high-tech and invitingly open meeting areas featuring computer work stations and large video carts and monitors, all invitingly out in the open, among plenty of well-stuffed couches and chairs, with various tables and end tables arrayed in convenient locations. There is one entrance into Room 200, which is (at this time, anyway) noticeably devoid of any wall décor, except for that of some wall-mounted technological equipment. The tables in the room are stylish and movable, the chairs, modern and plentiful. A short, wide cabinet stores lots of cables and equipment, including a dozen or so available laptop computers. A tall and very wide window runs along the back wall, looking out into the expansive, open hallway; passersby do stop and peek in at the meeting sessions now and then, though they are seldom seen by participants, who have the window behind their backs.

In the absence of artwork, posters, or other wall décor (perhaps such is in the works; this was a newly-opened room in the COT), the prominent aesthetic in COT 200 is the strong presence of technology, both in equipment and in ambiance: indeed, one might say that technology *is* the décor of this room. Like many of the so-labeled “smart” rooms on campus, COT 200 features a hard-wired podium with wireless networking capabilities and a nearby equipment closet filled with gadgets, components, and wires. Buttons on the podium operate a ceiling-mounted projector, aimed at a very large screen at the front of the room. Since one main focus of this training event involves how to innovatively import technology into university courses, as part of course redesign, the pervasive mood of high tech feels appropriate and natural, if somewhat spartan. Then

again, as this project begins, and the schedule/syllabus is presented, there are several other major topics planned for course emphasis besides just those of technology, including such topics as “learning styles,” “diversity,” “service learning,” and “scholarship of teaching and learning.” So the curriculum for this semester-length “course in course-re-design” is planned to present a fairly even balance between technical and non-technical material. Yet, as an overarching characterization of the scene, now “cased,” one cannot escape the prevailing sense of “technology, applied to higher learning.” As the action in this drama draws near, with analysis to eventually follow, the feel at this research scene is unmistakably dominated by a strong sense of technology. It is thematic, the motif. What remains to be seen is its influence over the discourse to come, as the drama unfolds.

Evolution of my Role, as Researcher (from Videotape Analyst to Participant-Observer)

It is interesting and revealing to look back across the scores of e-mails that I saved throughout the duration of this project, starting with the very first e-mail associated with my participation. Indeed, I am reminded that it was never my original intention to record the training sessions that ultimately served as the primary data for this dissertation, let alone that I should become a participant-observer in this training series. Aided by my dissertation director, I was introduced to the project director, pseudonym Nora Porter (aka NP) with the idea that I might study some existing videotapes of prior 90-minute training sessions overseen by Dr. Porter as part of her campus-wide program of TA training, as can be seen in the text of the e-mail below, which is edited only for de-identification purposes:

>Quoting Sharon Chaffee (then-director of graduate studies in my department)

>

>> Nora,

>>

>> Mike Zizzi is a PhD student who is interested in teacher training and adult

>> education. He's going to be in my discourse class next semester and is

>> hoping to study teacher training workshops for the major discourse paper in

>> the class. You briefly met Mike when we were both in line for coffee. I

>> immediately thought of your program. Would you be able to meet with him to

>> discuss whether it would be possible study archived workshops? If given

>> access, he's willing to contribute to the program in ways you would see as

>> appropriate. thanks, Sharon.

>>

>> Sharon Chaffee, Professor

>> Director of Graduate Studies

>> Communication Department

>Quoting Nora Porter

>Sharon and Mike,

>

>This would be a very interesting project. We have a lot of workshops on tape.

>I'm happy to discuss it.

>

>Next week would be better than this week.

>

>Nora

Obviously, the nature of my research with Dr. Porter's "course (re-)design project" (as it became formally known and billed) changed significantly from what was proposed in this early query. Once I actually met up with Dr. Porter, conferring with her in her office, my role began to change immediately, as she shared with me her plans for the training series and soon invited me to record any and all sessions for my data gathering. Right before the very first training session (Week 1, Year 1, significant parts of which are transcribed (Transcription Key available in Appendix A) and analyzed in detail in Appendix B), Dr. Porter sent out a reminder to all participants, and this notice included mention of my late-added role as researcher. Here is the relevant excerpt from that e-mail, dated February 6, 2007:

>Quoting Nora Porter

>Hi, everyone,

>Hope you are all ready to begin tomorrow, February 7, from 9:00 - 11:00, in

>Pelham 145. I am attaching the project plan for the first month. Pelham 145

>has 25 computer stations. I have advertised the project, so some graduate

>students may come to participate that I don't yet know about.

>

>Michael Zizzi, a graduate student from Communication, will be conducting

>research on our project. He will be there with consent forms and will just

>listen in. He is actually going to analyze the discourse from the project.

With my introduction of to the group thusly issued (“He will be there with consent forms and will just listen in”), little did I expect that, by the third session, I would be asked by NP to step away from the camcorder and fully participate in various pen-and-paper activities, as well as being asked to participate in a number of discussions, to the point of feeling free, by the later half of Year 1, to initiate my own participation (e.g., asking questions during sessions) at any point, just as any other participant was free to do.

It is likely that the development of my evolving role was accelerated by the working friendship that Dr. Porter and I formed, beginning with what I consider, in retrospect, an important exchange that took place Week 1, Year 1. This exchange took place as we walked together from the just-concluded first session in Pelham Hall downhill to her office in the Center of Technology (COT) building, which was a hearty five to ten minutes away, depending on walking speed and whether striding uphill, to Pelham, or downhill, to the COT. It was actually I who had proposed to Nora, while walking with her back to her office, to return her camcorder and tripod to the well-

stocked equipment closet within her office suite in the COT building, that we should relocate the training to the COT building. It would surely have been more convenient for me to keep recording the sessions in Pelham Hall, since that is the building where the communication department, and hence my own shared TA office, is housed. She had already offered that I could, once returning the equipment I was carrying, check out an even higher-quality camcorder and tripod (her best, in the closet) for my exclusive use during the whole semester; therefore, there would be no need, if we stayed in Pelham, for me to hike to the COT building and back for each weekly session. That is, if we stayed put, she, not I, would have to make the weekly hike to the sessions and back.

But the longish trek from Pelham to the COT was clearly bothering Nora, who was limping noticeably with a knee problem; plus, I had just experienced quite a bit of difficulty in getting good camera angles (where multiple interlocutors could be included in the one frame) in the Pelham computer lab, during the Week 1 session that had just concluded minutes before our walk together. Why don't we just move this whole show to the COT building, I offered to her. She expressed doubts that she could get the room that would work best, which was a high-tech classroom conveniently located right outside her office suite. Someone else had reserved that room, every Wednesday morning for the whole semester, just to have it available if need should arise. Despite her doubts, I encouraged Nora to negotiate the rescheduling of that more convenient (and video-friendlier) room, and Nora expediently succeeded with this request, such that, by the very next week, we began meeting for our sessions right outside her office in that preferred room, COT 200, which thereby became the home base of the training program, from that point on, for both years.

I share this interpersonal event (among a number of other tête-à-têtes we shared, early in the term) to support my claim that my role very quickly evolved from a researcher who would be attending the training sessions to “just listen in” (as stated in her e-mail to the group) to someone that Nora, herself, could trust as an interested, grateful, and helpful collaborator and even a confidant of sorts. The point is that, from the earliest stages (the walk-and-talk conversation described above occurring Week 1, Year 1), our quickly developing interpersonal and professional relationship likely helped bring about my being invited by her, in impromptu and natural ways during the Year 1 sessions, to participate in many training activities. This unexpected participation became even more noticeable as further weeks progressed and Nora came to discover my significant and long-term background (especially for a TA) in both college teaching and curriculum development, since teaching methods and curricular development were both central to the goals of this training series. I believe that my complex relationship with Nora provides a specially-informed understanding, not only of this key participant in my study, but, through close interaction with her, on and off site, of the whole of the discursive event I came to study and participate in.

Such contextual familiarity is prized in qualitative methodologies aimed at cultivating communication practice, so I find it important to assert that such is quite adequately in place. For two years I lived this scene, and for four years now, I have been scrutinizing and transcribing video and audio recordings of the 12-week carnival of teaching and learning, played out by a crew of top-echelon personalities at this large, prominent university—in fact, my own school, dating back to my freshman year 34 years

ago. I have a sense of this place, and I have enormous experience with and within the data, point I note for reasons of both methodological mandate and romantic flair.

Participants in the Study

The “cast of characters” appearing in the 22+ hours of training over 12 weeks, included the following categories of personnel:

- project staff and occasional guests:
- invited presenters (subject-matter experts), one or two presenting at each week;
- faculty participants/trainees: three faculty the first year; one faculty member the second year;
- graduate assistants, one assistant per faculty member;
- non-faculty participants/trainees, some of whom were presenters at a particular session, but trainees at the other sessions.

Along with the weekly presenters, the regular participants numbered approximately 8-10 each session, all serving as the erstwhile “students.” Most prominent among these “students” were three long-term university professors, all well-known and respected campus figures, one from the natural sciences (pseudonym, Ike), one from the humanities (aka Dom), and one from applied communication (aka Peg). Each of these professors was aided by a specially-funded graduate assistant (also serving as students in these training sessions), these assistants being specially-selected students in the second half of their doctoral programs of study and honored by the title “provost’s fellows” for their participation in this notable campus event. Ike’s assistant was Julia, who was occasionally vocal; Dom was assisted by Jason, who spoke less than half as much as

Julia, and Peg was assisted by Morningstar, of Native-American descent, who spoke very little the entire semester.

Additionally, each training session, across both years, featured one or two expert presenters, these presenters drawn from a varied pool of faculty and staff from several departments, including IT/Computing, Instructional Technology, Campus Diversity, Research on Teaching and Learning, etc. Some weekly presenters came directly from the project-sponsoring office of Teaching Assistant Excellence, presenting on specialized topics in learning theory, such as David Kolb's "cycle of learning" model and its four constituent "learning styles."

These meetings became a something of a ritual, held as they were from 9 a. m. to 11 a. m. every Wednesday morning. Perpetuating this sense of ritual, several participants attended both years of training, including certain members of Nora Porter's staff, some members of the instructional technology support team, who served both as presenters and session participants, and myself, as videographer, researcher, and sometimes-participant, over both years.

CHAPTER 4:

METHODOLOGY

Primary Analytic Goal

In sum, the central goal of this study, as earlier outlined as my research question, is to illuminate expressly *practical* understandings and possibilities for dialogic interaction (i.e., *discursive interaction that features open and productive engagement of difference*) within the setting of faculty development (as a road into further work in the larger arena of teaching and learning, a.k.a. the classroom). In terms of analysis, then, I therefore seek *not* the components of a *generalized* “container” for dialogue, as Isaacs (1999) has termed dialogue’s necessary setting, but a model of both the *overarching*, thereby *situational*, variables and the discursively *enacted*, thereby *interactional*, variables that emerge as central to the context at hand: faculty development and training. In this way, I aim to understand processes of a reflexive system, within and of dialogue, wherein situation and interaction make and remake each other.

My intention, then, through this study, is to find and support answers to my central research question by analyzing a fertile corpus of hand-gathered data, in the form of approximately 48 hours of video and audio recordings (the audio mostly redundant for all sessions, except three that were not videotaped, for reasons of participant preference) made during a semester-long program, two or more hours per week, of faculty-training training.

In this chapter I will provide thorough and relevant rationale for method and approach, along with procedural details. The topics I will cover include an overview of the event from which my data arise; a methodologically oriented summary of key definitions and theoretical commitments; my methods of data collection, recorded format conversion, and sequence logging; my transcription system and its rationale; my methods for secondary data (interviews) collection and transcription; and my methods of assurance for human subject protection.

Brief Overview of Discursive Event under Investigation

This faculty training program was orchestrated and presented through the campus-wide teacher-development office (aimed primarily at training teaching assistants) at large, public, Western university. The 12-week training program (11 sessions, skipping Spring Break) was piloted this first year (aka *Year 1*), then modified and repeated a second year (though with fewer participants), as part of a still-ongoing (in 2011) effort toward refining this training program. The focus of program was curriculum development—curriculum revision, in particular, or, to use the terms of the training, “course re-design.” I attended and recorded all training sessions, both years, but due to the problematically small group the second year (including just one faculty trainee), I will restrict my main analysis to events and discourse from the first, more interactive and eventful, workshop series in Year 1.

Following a period (about a month) of screening and approval by the project director (pseudonym, Nora Porter, aka NP), in scheduled or impromptu meetings once or twice a week for two months prior to the onset of the initial training sessions, Year 1, I was formally invited to videorecord the project sessions for my academic research, with

the expectation (hereby borne out) that this data collection would ultimately serve as the substance of my dissertation research. Thusly invited, I operated a single camcorder at all sessions, actively following the action as I saw fit, occasionally drawing close-ups of participants and of environmental factors. My back-up audio-recordings, made each session, typically included several minutes of pre- and post-session conversation.

Along with the recordings of the training sessions, as my primary data, my study also includes very important secondary data, in the form of 11 interviews (10 audiorecorded, average length, about 40 minutes each) of principal participants, in which I inquired about their reasons for participation and feelings about their contributions. These interviews have proven invaluable toward aiding the selection process of segments for transcription and scrutiny. Furthermore, the interviews have, in some cases, proven invaluable (more at primary than secondary data) in support of interpretive claims made in the data analysis.

Overview of Definitions, Commitments, and Dialogue-Analytic Approach

Before presenting my rationale for a hybridized analytic approach and also my procedural methods, I first present the following summary of key definitions, commitments, intent, and general approach, for the analysis of the data at hand, toward an improved understanding of dialogue in teaching and learning, particularly in the present setting of faculty development.

By *dialogue*, I refer to discursive interaction that courts, features, and appreciates the display and engagement of difference, with a prevailing sense, owing to Buber (and many cited interpreters of his work), of openness, authenticity, and mutuality, toward a general goal of not so much “establishing common ground” as of “creating new ground,”

new ground (though not necessarily agreement or even *harmony*) that would otherwise be unlikely, if even possible, without the multiple inputs and well-intended, if at times vigorous, engagement, up to and including strident disagreement. I thereby hold to a definition of dialogue that expressly privileges communication theory as regards dialogue.

As Cissna and Anderson (2004) specify, where communication theory informs dialogue theory, three central tendencies prevail: first, a *constitutive* view of meaning, wherein “meaning, often unexpected meaning, emerges in the encounter between self and other” (p. 196); second, a recognition that self, perhaps better thought of as identity, is itself constituted in interaction and thereby always in flux, in process; and thirdly (and here the authors acknowledge Bakhtin’s widespread influence across the discipline), a foundational recognition that all utterances are connected: “that all talk presupposes an ongoing conversation in which one merely participates for a time” (p. 196). That is what I mean—from endless possible meanings and stances, as reviewed in depth in the review of the literature—by the term *dialogue*.

By *teaching and learning*, as a special site or context for dialogue, I would clarify that my forthcoming analysis orients to “teaching and learning” interaction that takes place within formalized, institutional learning settings, wherein one person (possibly two, as in team teaching) holds the understood role of teacher, and the others present are understood there as learners—in contrast to other prospective contexts wherein interaction might involve a dialogic engagement of difference and also lead, arguably, to some forms of “teaching and learning,” such as any workplace meeting or other gathering

that might possibly feature “teaching and learning,” given felicitous conditions and a spirit of inquiry.

However, I do not mean to narrow my scope, concerning “teaching and learning,” to that of the “classroom,” per se, especially since the discourse I am analyzing does not itself, derive from a traditional classroom. As I tease out implications from my analysis, I would surely not *exclude* classroom applications, ubiquitous as these are (as institutionalized learning), especially for classrooms where the learners are at, or at least near, a college-level of intellectual and experiential maturity and can therefore offer perspectives with reasonable ambition for *mutuality* in the dialogic give and take. Exactly where to set the grade-level “low bar,” I do not know. That is a question for another time, and it has, indeed, been asked (e.g., McCaw, 2008) if not yet answered. Since my data arise from a setting of adult learning, my analytical intent is to inform dialogic practices in formalized settings of teaching and learning where participants are at least ostensibly adults.

Moreover, the learners in this present study are not only adults, but also significant members of the university community, all three of the participating faculty holding full professor status, their hand-picked graduate assistants funded generously by the university provost, and the various staff involved holding well-regarded university positions in pedagogy and technology implementation. These are learners quite likely to have something to say, during the three-months-plus of weekly two-hour sessions that (along with weekly, synchronous, online sessions of about an hour each), comprised this experimental training series, which was structured, by its very design and stated intent, to emulate and even model a technologically up-to-date *college class*.

This project called, specifically, for learners to *practice* what the various presenters *preached*, reworking, step-by-step, a specific course that each faculty member would designate Week 1, toward learning and even implementing the overall training goal: providing methods, both pedagogical and technological, by which faculty can revise and update existing courses.

So without actually being a traditional (graded) class, which I have argued tends to be discursively governed by (or at least impaired by) what I have labeled a prevailing dilemma of traditional classrooms (the fear that “if I contradict or critique the teacher, my grade will suffer”), this training event yet approaches a classroom in look and feel—very special, in this important way, among the wider field of “faculty training.” Indeed many of the trainees are not even faculty.

This combination of program and participants indeed presents a special and fertile setting for the production of discursive data that includes plentiful and well varied education-oriented exchanges that feature the scarce, almost mythical, creature I am after: educational dialogue: the free and valued *engagement of difference* in a formal learning setting, seen in different ways, at different levels, and spanning different realms of critique and implication, from “that idea is not working for me” (conceptual) to “this whole class is not working for me” (relational/practical).

As indicated in this chapter’s opening, I will, in my twin chapters of analysis, select and examine what I perceive (and interviewing data support) as particularly interesting and illuminating exchanges. I will first, in Chapter 5, explore these moments for their situational illumination, relevance and impact. Following that situation-level dialogic analysis, I will move, in Chapter 6, to my interactional-level of dialogic analysis.

To do so, I will utilize, as analytic starting point, an updated version of my pragmatics of dialogue model (Craig & Zizzi, 2007; Zizzi, 2008a, 2008b). My goal is to give this model a more rigorous workout than has been possible in article-length treatment, toward refining this model of the pragmatics of dialogue—expressly as oriented to teaching and learning—a model of improved practical utility, especially.

More specifically, this pragmatics of dialogue model allows a systematic focus upon observable processes and patterns of noteworthy sequences of discursive interaction, particularly as would eventually lead to the apparent co-creation of new insights, ideas, relational developments, and implications for follow-up action, all of this “productivity” constituting the processes and outcomes of *dialogue in teaching and learning*, as synthesized and proposed in the review of the literature. In the existing “pragmatics” model (first by Craig & Zizzi, 2007, then furthered by my own work), these moves, processes and patterns are sought in three general, sometimes overlapping, stages, as follows:

- (1) Moves that work to *create discursive openings*, that make space for the engagement of difference
- (2) Moves that work to *sustain discursive engagement*, that keep difference alive
- (3) Moves that work to *generate and reveal discursive productivity*, as seen in
 - (a) conceptual innovation/movement (emergence of new ideas)
 - (b) relational development (a sense of solidarity, *or not!*, arises)
 - (c) practical plans and implications (follow-up actions are determined)

I would note that this model has, for more than three years, sat ostensibly dormant (not written about, anyway), while my variously conducted personal investigation toward

a compelling theory of dialogue in teaching and learning nonetheless progressed vigorously, including through periodic consultation, formal or casual, with faculty mentors as regarded new experiences, readings, and ideas, since the original data gathering. Indeed, I became much better informed by these three years of additional reading and re-reading, toward ongoing development in my own understanding of the central authors and concepts undergirding a dialogic approach to understanding educational discourse. I have further benefited from several events of public presentation and enlightening scholarly discussion of selected data segments, and also through voluminous classroom experimentation, across approximately 25 course sections taught or assisted since I first conceived the model as second-year doctoral student (this final year of doctoral study being my sixth).

My point, here, is that I next present the following analysis, in its two levels, not so much as “how a dialogic discourse analysis *should* be done”; rather, I aim to exemplify how such an analysis *could* be done, my proposal informed by a significant period (roughly four years) of reflection upon both my data and how it might be most productively and usefully analyzed. My analytic methods are, therefore, admittedly experimental and under ongoing development, even if developed with due cognizance of prior relevant methodologies, as were duly surveyed in the Review of the Literature.

Metatheoretical Stance: Communication as Practice, Cultivated

Before presenting data gathering, processing, and analysis procedures, I would first assert and substantiate my metatheoretical stance: communication as practical theory. In numerous and progressive developments since the late 1980s, Craig and Tracy have argued that communication study is rightly considered not an empirical science, but

a practical discipline (Craig, 1993, 1996, 1999; Craig & Tracy, 1995; 2003; Tracy & Craig, 2010). In the latter article (2010) within this long-developing series of analyses, Tracy and Craig explain,

Rather than assuming that the ultimate goal of inquiry should be to produce descriptions and theoretical explanations of in empirical phenomena, as is the case when the discipline is conceived as a science, a *practical* discipline takes its ultimate goal to be the *cultivation* of practice. (p. 147, emphasis added)

The idea of communicative practice, itself, has gained traction through the recent and much cited work of Etienne Wenger's (1999) *Communities of Practice*. As regards learning, specifically, Wenger's "practice" is, indeed, the evolution of "shared histories of learning" (p. 86). Through processes of participation and reification "intertwined over time" (p. 87), community is both formed by, and formative of, practices that have meaningfulness (and hence, create meaning, socially) to those participating. Wenger's claims processors (subjects of his study) are ever operating in a tension of continuity and discontinuity, as "practice is not an object but rather an emergent structure that persists like being both perturbable and resilient" (p. 93). Wenger sees practice—and identity, itself—as thusly ever in flux, even as the moment, itself, stabilizes. In this way communicative practices serve as both sources of continuity, that is, bases for a stability of identity (resilience) among participants, and openings for change, possibilities of shared enterprise in which community is affirmed or perhaps reified through change itself, which is a reaction to the dilemmas and tensions experienced by community members to practices that may work in some contexts, but not others. For example, Tracy (1997a), Tracy and Muller (1994), and Tracy and Naughton (1994) have attended closely

to the practice of public academic discussion, particularly academic colloquia, wherein the authors have illuminated a number of goals, challenges, and even dilemmas, as academics engage in the practice of scholarly deliberation, a practice the authors show as complex and sometimes dilemmatic, with participants needing both to display high levels of competence while also attending to nuances of face needs that vary from case to case.

Another strain of communication-as-practice research conducted by Tracy and numerous associates includes several investigations into the practice of discussion and debate in the setting of the school board meetings. For example, Craig and Tracy (2003) examined practical issues regarding the very definition, during school board meetings, of “the issue” under discussion. Tracy and Ashcraft (2001) considered school board deliberation, highlighting the function of semantic (wording) difficulties in complicating the practice of resolving group dilemmas. Another strain of discursive mayhem—well, dilemmas of discursive practice—have surfaced in the analytic work of Tracy and Muller (2001), who showed that is not just the issue definition or other problematic disputes of wording, but also problem formulation itself that confound the practice of productive discussion in school board meetings.

One additional arena for researching specific communicative practices examined by Tracy and associates has centered upon police-citizen interaction, including the interactions of 911 call-takers and citizens in distress (e.g., Tracy, 1997b; Tracy & Anderson, 1999; Tracy & Agne, 2002; Tracy, K. & Tracy, S. J. 1998; Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K., 1998). Across this rich and thorough set of analyses (Tracy’s “911 project”), a common theme is communication as a set of known—or knowable, through analysis—practices, varying in ways that can be teased out and informed by discourse analytic

methodologies. Tracy (2005; Tracy & Craig, 2010) identifies several other essential features of discourse analysis that aims to inform practice, which are met in the present study, as shall be next detailed. These defining features include the development of rich understandings of the practice at hand, these understandings gained ethnographically, over many hours of exposure, recording, and careful examination, in multiple sittings, of recorded and transcribed data.

Specific Analytic Orientation: Language as Social Interaction (LSI)

With roots in the ethnography of communication, anthropology, sociolinguistics, and various discursive interests within or connected to communication, LSI covers wide ground in its general interest in the functions and processes of language as performed, as practiced, comprising a number of scholarly perspectives variously concerned with close examination of communication and language (Tracy & Haspel, 2004). Indeed, these authors locate LSI as “the residence of preference for those who believe that studying action in its situated and messy particularity is the best way to understand communicative life” (p. 789). Arguably, LSI, as an analytic framework, takes root in Austin’s (1962) speech-act theory, which purported to refocus scholars from what language *says* to what language *does*: that is language as performance, language as action. The scholarly legacy of speech act theory—a legacy firmed up around the edges by Goffman’s (1959) “dramaturgical perspective” and more recent performativists, such as Bauman and Briggs (1990)—is a legacy that actually rests, as I see it, mainly upon Burke’s (1945) dramatism, which far earlier had highlighted communication as symbolic *action* that derives meaning from multifaceted contextual constructs, the five terms of his dramatisitic pentad as his best-known heuristic. Burke has his predecessors, too, along with unwitting

contemporaries, such as Bakhtin, writing in Russia in the decades following the Revolution, in his own way paralleling Burke's "literature as equipment for living" through his exploration of discourse in the novel, producing his *dialogism*, now a bastion of discourse theory.

These are foundational perspectives of language as social action, upon which many varying themes and arenas of analysis have been built, including LSI. More expressly, LSI scholarship rests on the premise that we can observe and study how talk makes talk, as discourse analysts and, finer-grained yet, conversation analysts, have been doing since Austin's speech acts helped Dell Hymes to formulate and propose the ethnography of communication, with John Gumperz co-editing a major introductory volume (1972). Around the same period appeared, Paul Grice's (1974) conversational "maxims," which, aided by Ochs' (1979) perspective on both language and theory and a general renaissance of interest in the educational pragmatics of Dewey, opened a theoretical space for a resurgence of pragmatics in the discursive and practical theory of Craig and Tracy (e.g., 1995, 2005). Numerous others along the way, though not necessarily considered as scholars of communication, *per se* (such as John Searle, Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Deborah Cameron, et al.) have contributed to the scholarly web of communication's subfield of language and social interaction, 1960s to the present. Most directly relevant to both of my theoretical perspective and my research site, LSI scholars, such as Paul Drew and John Heritage (along with the much-herein-cited Craig and Tracy) have demonstrated particular interest in the discursive dilemmas inherent a variety of institutional settings, including attention given to analysis of facework and other performative aspects of scholarly discussion and interaction (c.f. Tracy & Muller,

1994).

Primary Data Collection (Digital Recordings of all Training Sessions)

I will next describe the methods I used for gathering my primary and secondary data. Prior to arrival of the participants, for every mid-morning (9 to 11 a.m.) training session (for both years of data collection), I would set up my recording apparatus, both video and audio. First I would place upon a table, somewhere near the center of the room, my digital voice recorder, a high-quality and sensitive Olympus, model WS-300, and set the device into the record mode, to commence recording before participants even arrived. In this fashion, I ensured that my audiorecording device was visible to all participants, though I would begin recording with the relatively tiny device prior to the even-more-conspicuous setting up of my video equipment. (Similarly, in the interest of data completeness, I would leave on the small device, still recording, as I packed up the video equipment at session's end.) I attended and videorecorded all meeting sessions, across both years, with the exception of three Year 1 sessions that I audiorecorded only, due to requests made by camera-shy guest presenters who preferred that they not be video-recorded (all of whom, however, granted permission for audiorecording).

Except for the three audio-only cases, I would, once my voice recorder was placed and set to record, proceed to set up my digital camcorder (miniDV format) and tripod, both of which were routinely supplied by the Teaching Assistant Excellence (TAE) office, located just across the hall from Room 200. I would position myself as far as possible into a front corner of the room, to the presenter's right. This afforded the best, and fullest, view of the participants, though I could rarely, if ever, get all participants into one shot, since I simply could not back up far enough away for such a wide view as

would be needed for that complete scene framing. Because of this limitation in my viewable video frame, there was no question but that I would have to move the camera actively throughout the sessions; a fixed, unchanging (and consistent) camera focus and angle would necessarily eclipse too much of the action. Because of this need for frequent camera moving, I did my best to develop a “director’s eye,” for the heart of the action underway, which included the difficult goal of capturing all speakers, as they spoke, an impossibility, actually, without knowing ahead of time (as a film director would) who would speak when. So some spoken utterances are made off-camera, a shortcoming in my data, a shortcoming mitigated by the availability, because of the necessarily active style of video-recording, of occasional close-ups and other recording decisions I made moment by moment, as I panned around to capture interesting nonvocal aspects of the developing scene, for example, the time on the clock, the looks on faces of certain listeners, and the facts about what people were doing on their laptops, when they were supposed to be either taking notes or participating in computer-centered group activities.

As I video recorded the meetings, I periodically abandoned the camera to take a seat at the table that I would, each week, drag over next to my camera; I did this so that I could maintain a running written log (with videotape timing noted) of the general topics and events as they unfolded at each meeting, making a special point to note, by hand-drawn “stars,” the exchanges and events that seemed especially engaging, vigorous, or otherwise interesting, such as apparent conflict arising or simply moments with multiple parties (preferably three or more) actively engaged. An example of one of these handwritten “running logs (made during Session 6, one of the sessions in which a

significant exchange is transcribed and analyzed) is included as part of Appendix C, examples of hand-written data logs, as collection and annotated.

Across the many semesters that have come and gone since the Year 1 data were collected—and analytic methods and possibilities came to be considered, aided by various opportunities for data presentation and vigorous scholarly discussion (i.e. during “data sessions”)—these on-the-spot running logs, with their telltale “stars,” became crucial in helping to identify segments for added scrutiny and possible selection and transcription for closer analysis. I consider this a significant methodological feature of my study, as would be true of any discourse analysis, when the data analyst is also the one who has performed the data collection, live, and not just as observer, but as participant-observer. I was living the experience while recording my data, an excellent basis for on-the-fly determinations, *in situ*, of what might become important in future analysis.

Follow-up Data-review, Format Conversion, and Sequence Logging

Each week, following the taping of the classroom meetings, I would more closely scrutinize the recorded data, in three- to four-hour sessions of “media transfer” and closer data logging. I carefully reviewed the digital videotapes (mini-DV format) in real-time, while converting the digital files from tape to DVD format. This system of data conversion, from tape to disc, prove beneficial not only in rendering a physical form (DVD) usable in many workstations (unlike tape, which can only be used with a camcorder connected to the workstation), it further provided an opportunity for re-consideration of the data in a real-time flow, in which I was removed from the

participation element of my participant-observer role; I could judge interactional events more objectively in the removed quite of my work station.

That is, in a best-of-both-worlds scenario, I was able to follow up my live data collection with a prompt and close review and more-detailed logging of the recorded sessions, especially noting the timings and details of the “starred” exchanges that had seemed particularly interesting or engaging while happening live. An example of one of these more-detailed session logs made during data conversion (tape to DVD) is included as the second page of Appendix C. Further, I present, in the aforementioned Appendix B, a complete discursive log of the initial training session, to provide a thorough look at the discursive unfolding of a complete session, turn by turn, for the full two hours.

Through this double-viewing and double-logging, I have twice examined the entirety of my Year 1 recordings (video and, when needed, also audio), an arduous effort resulting in a rich familiarity and thorough written log, for ease of visual inspection, of the entire training program. Ultimately, I have created a collection of transcribed exchanges featuring moves and interactions that embody the ideals and practices of dialogic exchange. This effort, though not formally quantified, has enabled me to grasp the relative frequency (or should I say, infrequency) of these exchanges (how often, how spaced, which participants are most regularly seen in these exchanges, etc.). I have further kept my eyes open for other observable elements that emerged as interesting, for example, the relative amount of talk per participant, under varying conditions, for example the significant reticence—near silence, actually—throughout the term, of faculty member Peg’s graduate assistant, Morningstar. As I analyze the discourse in my selected exchanges, as is necessary to my emerging arguments, I will also support my analysis,

where possible and helpful, by reference to relevant segments of participant interviews (my secondary data, as will be detailed later in this chapter) as well as to observations noted in log notes, scratch notes and/or field notes.

Selection of Data for Analysis

Considerable time, effort and experimentation have failed to produce a hard and fast (objective and replicable) system of selecting the discursive events that warrant transcription and analysis. For example, I have explored such possibilities as “extended passages featuring three or more interlocutors,” “multiple party interactions lasting more than two minutes,” and “passages off apparent conflict.” None of these systems proved fruitful, and all three are problematic in that they might appear, on the surface, objective and empirical yet require significant amounts of judgment, especially as regards the boundaries of discursive passages. As classroom discourse unfolds, the boundary of when one passage or exchange ends and a new one begins is often a matter of opinion, which significantly hindered my early efforts to identify passages for analysis in such systematic ways.

Along those lines, Elinor Ochs (1979/2006) offers guidance, in her seminal article, “Transcription as Theory,” emphasizing the fact that *transcription is a selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions* (p. 167, emphasis in original). There is, Ochs suggests, no escaping the subjective, even intuitive, processes by which discourse analysts hand pick data segments to be presented and analyzed in studies using discourse analytic methods to serve pre-existing interests, orientations, and needs. Consider, for example, Hutchby’s (1996/2006) well-regarded study of turn taking in British radio call-in shows and the attendant dimensions of power that arise during caller-

host exchanges. Hutchby makes a number of points, for example the power of the host to open up or to delimit “the boundaries of the dispute’s agenda” (p, 524), and he provides an example of this process in a transcript excerpt, wherein the simple use of the one-word question “So?” by the host “challenges the validity or relevance of the caller’s complaint within the terms of her own agenda” (p. 525). That is, Hutchby, having considered the data in the fullness of his experience with it, whatever that may fully entail, discovers a point or idea relevant to his interests and commitments, and he presents this analytic point, affirming it and demonstrating how it works through a well-chosen exemplar, one he hopes will serve as illustrative, excerpted from his recordings.

But why, the reader of any DA analysis may wonder, is *this* segment of his data explored and not some other? Is the reader somehow assured that all of the available data have been systematically combed through such that any and all important points and their apt analysis are assuredly brought to the surface? Of course this cannot be assured. As readers, we do trust that Hutchby is well familiar with his data, and we can judge for ourselves the importance of the analytic points he is making and the quality of the evidence by which he supports and illustrates these points. But we do not imagine that there are not some other prospective points that could be made from the same data, especially if we were to consider other moments of Hutchby’s call-in show.

In fact, as anyone who has participated in discourse analysis “data sessions” knows (and several of these were conducted as aids to my own analysis, as previously mentioned), there are numerous points, sometimes competing, that can be made from the very same data segments presented. Consider even the single word Hutchby illuminates. Does Hutchby’s radio call-in host’s “So?” truly challenge the validity of the caller’s

remark, or does it legitimize this very remark, by acknowledging the probability that there is a relevance worth fleshing out? It would be more dismissive (hence more boundary-definitional), one might counter, to Hutchby, to not use the continuer “So?” rather to simply make a comment in another direction. My aim here is not to debate Hutchby but to acknowledge what Ochs points out, in terms of the subjectivity, and possibly even bias, that any informed performer (or reader) of qualitative research, including DA work, must guard against—or at least watch for—study by study.

Indeed there are more quantitative modes of discursive analysis, such as content analysis of texts and interaction analysis, which examines, codes, and categorize textual data, aided by statistical analysis of interaction, such as my own unpublished study of 30 written narratives regarding experiences with “driving while annoyed.” But the umbrella of qualitative research, under which stands most work in language and social interaction, and under that, discourse analysis, is defined by interpretive approaches that, Ochs, as cited above, asserts, includes the rendering and analysis of transcripts in a *selective process reflecting theoretical goals and definitions*. Therefore, it is not only understood, but indeed required, that the analyst would hold—and spell out—the orientation and aims, that is, the biases, of the analysis.

In this case, then, I would claim that I am looking for discursively performed interaction that will help to reveal, both at situational and interactional levels, the processes, experiences, and products of *dialogue* in teaching and learning, specifically in the context of faculty development. By dialogue, as I have parsed in considerable detail in the Review of the Literature, I do not mean, as is common in pedagogical literature, the simple engagement of multiple voices; rather, and more relevantly to communication

studies, the *dialogue* I seek to better understand invokes, among other attributes, the openness of Rogers' unconditional positive regard, the delicate fragility of Buber's meeting at the narrow ridge, the elevation of Other of Levinas's face-to-face, the productivity of Bohm's social intelligence, the dialectical tensions of Baxter's relational dialectics, the problematic of Hawes's dialogical double-bind, the orienting control of Deetz's "conditions under which," the utility of Craig and Tracy's practical theory, and the intersubjectivity of Bakhtin's heteroglossia, as it funnels, in the here and now, in the chronotope of endlessly connected discourse, that is, of the boundlessness of dialogue—all of which are communicational sensitivities and all of which are necessary to the emergence of some kind of "productivity" within a dialogue of teaching and learning.

I do not intend to perform a content analysis or an interactional categorization; I intend to designate, having participated richly at and around my research site, before, during, and after the event held therein, several revealing moments of discursive interaction and perform analysis of these telltale moments. As I have earlier suggested, I intend to shed light upon as-yet unseen (or undertheorized) processes that operate on both situational level (the big picture of "*Can we talk?*") and interactional level (the little picture of "*How can we, as university colleagues of varying interests and status, talk, together?*").

Since I am claiming the special background and training needed for productive and robust analysis of the events I hand pick, transcribe, and analyze, I should also remind that my specialization with this data includes even the experience of an additional full semester of participation and data gathering, when the training was repeated the following year. I am not studying the Year-2 data, but I am surely informed by it, in

terms of “what happened” as weighed against “what else might have happened,” which is the perspective availed by participating twice in the single event one would analyze.

That, I hold as the theoretical underpinnings, variegated and intertwined as they are, for my forthcoming analysis of the Year 1 training event I now move to analyze. Still, I affirm my commitment to studying data first, then making claims, not the other way around, wherein one might present a model, then look for substantiation of it. That is, I hope to help shape a new and improved understanding of dialogue in teaching and learning, not affirm an existing model. I will therefore strive to let the data speak, as I listen and look for relevant discursive moves and patterns that, taken together, will help me to conceptualize and present a definition and model of classroom dialogue that is not just pedagogically useful (as Alexander, 2005; 2008, has already done), but also theoretically anchored in the communicational perspective of dialogue, one aimed at opening spaces for, and productively engaging, *difference*.

Transcription System and Rationale

During the above-described process of the Year-1 data review and conversion to DVD—some of this work performed as research for preliminary studies (c.f., Craig & Zizzi, 2007; Zizzi, 2007; 2008a; 2008b;)—selected segments of the meetings were also transcribed for closer analysis, some segments transcribed—depending upon intent—by the customary Jeffersonian conventions for conversation analysis (CA), and other segments I transcribed in somewhat lesser detail, more in line with the transcription system modeled in numerous discourse studies previously cited, such that repairs and hesitation markers are featured, although without notation of varying syllabic intonations and other prosodic nuances typically indicated in Jeffersonian-style transcripts. For this

dissertation, I present transcription at a level that parallels conventions of discourse analysis, such as that modeled by Tracy and various co-authors in recent research, except for a case or two, wherein some existing transcripts are already available in greater detail, since these more detailed transcripts already exist, rendered by me for previous study or presentation.

Such variability in transcription detail, among transcribed segments of a single study, is not unprecedented in scholarly literature. For example, throughout Henning's (2008) book-length study, the author demonstrates a parallel methodological flexibility: his various transcribed segments often differ in look and style, depending upon his analytic usage. Even so, none of the many transcripts Henning presents in his book shows the level of detail that I hold as baseline in my own transcription for this dissertation—showing repairs, restarts, and hesitation markers. Still—and by way of comparison to my own transcription methods—the omission of repairs and other nonessential details in Henning's transcripts seems reasonable, considering the basic level of analysis he applies to the transcript segments. In fact, some of his analytic points are shown embedded in the transcript itself, differentiated from the actual speaker utterances via the use of underscoring. For example, under a speaking turn in which the teacher has simply asked, “What else?”, Henning explains, “This question was intended to explore the group's thinking” (2008, p. 81; underscoring in original). Little in that analytic point rests upon, say, the teacher's intonation, or whether the utterance actually came out, “Wh- what else?”

For further comparison to my own system, I would note that, across the five studies that comprise the book-length study by Cole & Zuengler (2008), wherein

different analysts worked from the same transcript, all of the transcribed segments, usually brief, are shown quite close to the CA level of detail, which, again, is natural given the depth of potential analysis rendered for the brief passages (many under one minute in duration) selected for analysis. Clearly, different levels of analysis, sometimes tied to sheer duration of segments, serve as factors for deciding, in discourse analysis, upon level of detail needed for transcription. One or two of my transcripts are, perhaps, a bit more detailed than need be, having been, as I have just mentioned, rendered for preliminary purposes requiring close examination. My overarching point here is that the baseline level I use throughout my transcription consistently shows, at minimum, hesitations and repairs, since these are often telltale and important features for analysis. This baseline (especially showing repairs), follows the standard presented by discourse-analysis methodologist Deborah Cameron (2001), in *Working with Spoken Discourse*, for the identification of prospectively difficult or challenging moments, such as can be expected during periods prospectively featuring the “engagement of difference.”

As I present my analysis, I will, where it would seem helpful, make reference to numbered lines of text from transcript excerpts presented in Appendices D and E, while also presenting, in text, brief passages from those transcribed excerpts, to support my analysis. That is customary practice, but where I hope to offer some methodological innovation is in the use, for selected data excerpts, of visual data in support of discursive analysis. As Cameron (2001) further points out, visual cues available in videorecordings (as opposed to audio-only recordings) can bear significantly upon discursive interaction and aid analysis; however, to include such details in a transcript is prohibitively “a complex undertaking,” since “the transcriber must not only find conventional ways to

represent participants' body movements and the direction of their gaze, s/he must also articulate the visual with the verbal information" (p. 38). This burden of transcription is indeed prohibitive, hence infrequently used. Cameron further warns that such nonverbal notation is not worth the effort unless it can be shown to bear directly upon the research interests at hand, since, "if it is not relevant, then there is nothing (except extra work) to be gained by using the more comprehensive recording technique" (p. 39) of videorecording.

However, what was not so available at Cameron's writing, perhaps—digital recording and the ability to capture screen shots on the same computer used for transcription—is of course readily available now, such that nonverbal cues need not be painstakingly and systematically rendered in transcription, provided the researcher knows his/her way around the computer, as has been modeled, if infrequently, with illuminating, sometimes even titillating, effect (e.g. Mirivel, 2006), though indeed a time-consuming endeavor, I will attest, having taken these pains. I reserve this time-costly method for the two instances in my selected data—one event in each chapter of analysis—where, heeding Cameron's warning, I believe that what is revealed in the screen shots I imbedded truly aid in showing my analytic points to a significantly enhanced degree, namely for the above-mentioned turning point of the whole training session and also for final segment to be analyzed, where a dialogic success featured a marked physical manifestation, revealing the very embodiment of what I emphasized, in Chapters 1 and 2, that I am after, thematically, and that is a blurring of the roles in teaching and learning, toward the proposed overhaul of the transmission model of communication, at least in this context of education.

One other transcriptional innovation, if a minor one, that I propose as useful and will employ (as noted in the Transcription key, Appendix A), is the use of italics to indicate what I call an in-sentence *attitudinal shift* detectable in an uttered word or phrase. Even the most detailed use of Jeffersonian conventions used in conversation analysis, which presents the most detailed forms of transcription (Cameron, 2001), does not allow for the indication of such attitudinal emphasis, *per se*, except as might be indicated in the rising or falling of pitch or the drawing out of syllables. Close to the attitudinal shift that I mean to bring out, Cameron (2001), in listing prosodic and paralinguistic features of speech discernible to the transcriptionist, does include “voice quality” and “stress” (p.37) along with such features as pitch, rhythm, pace, and loudness, but I mean to innovate a bit in characterizing an expressly *attitudinal emphasis*. Indeed, there’s only so much that can be done typographically to indicate the unlimited nuances of prosody in speech, but this is one innovation I am exemplifying in this study that I believe will make intuitive sense to the reader. It is not emphasis in the sense of a more forceful volume; it is intoned emphasis in the sense of perhaps irony, analogous, in spoken language, to the typographical use of quotation marks or even the gesturing of quotation marks with one’s fingers (“air quotes,” as some call them).

Secondary Data (Audio-recorded Interviews with Key Project Participants)

In addition to observing and recording the two full-semester courses of weekly, two-hour meetings held in the Center for Technology building on campus, as my primary data, I further worked to meet the practical discourse analysis mandates of Tracy and Craig (cf. 2010). These mandates, since the analytic thrust aims at the informed cultivation of communication practice, requires enriched familiarity with the practice,

with the site of research, and even, where possible, with the participants. Therefore, I gathered secondary data, interviewing all available group members (11 interviews, total), all but one of these interviews (the one with NP, the director) having been audio recorded. Segments of the interviews that were selected for transcription are presented as Appendix E, and one complete interview is transcribed, by way of illustrative example, as Appendix F.

Although I would pull up well short of defining my study as *ethnographic*—preferring, instead, for my method of dialogic discourse analysis the methodological descriptor *ethnographically informed discourse analysis*—I did perform much of my interviewing in carefully planned and monitored stages, as prescribed by Lindlof and Taylor (2002) in *Qualitative Research Methods*. If not ethnography, *per se*, the systematic, yet open-ended, interviewing and related ethnographic moves (e.g., site map created) proved especially helpful and sometimes enlightening in my efforts to unpack bases of meaning making—that is, for performing well-grounded discourse analysis—of the interaction among my participants. As suggested above, I found the prior (pre-interview) process of having very-actively recording the sessions (getting to know, in the process, the participants) to serve as an interactive and a familiarizing agent prior to conducting the interviews. To wheel around and aim a camera directly at meeting participants, who have granted prior permission by signing detailed consent forms (see Appendix G), is to gain a very special sense of connection with that participant, I found. My interviews thereafter were surely aided by this pre-established rapport, though unusual in form.

After scheduling interviews with each respective participant, I visited the offices (scattered across campus) of the participants and interviewed them there or elsewhere on campus, if they preferred. Throughout the interviewing phase of my research, I tinkered with an ongoing series of interview schedules and guides, per direction availed in Lindlof and Taylor (2002). As my interviews progressed, I came to feel more inclined, given my exposure to the group, to prefer the more “nondirective” (p. 195) approach of the more-flexible interview guide, given the interpretive and “layered” levels of meaning I am after. An example of this broader-brushed interviewing style is provided by Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, and Alberts (2006), who describe their interviewing approach as “provid[ing] a space where participants could narrate their experiences in an uninterrupted manner ‘from the beginning’” (p. 156).

Regardless of preparation—that is, whether I used interview guide or schedule or, in a couple cases, just a blank sheet of paper and asked questions asked from memory—here are six fundamental lines of questioning that I used for all interviews:

- 1) What are your reasons for participating in this training experience?
- 2) How does this experience compares with other task-force-type projects in which you have participated?
- 3) What are some memorable contributions that you have made in the group discussion, including the related topics that helped you to think of and share these contributions.
- 4) How has this contribution developed, in the discussions, whether just at that session or thereafter, at following sessions?
- 5) Has there been an intended contribution of yours (large or small) that did not

really make it into further discussion, though it might have had effect if engaged further by the group?

6) What further feelings, about your participation in these discussions, would you share, to help me with my research into the feelings of ‘dialogue’?

As mentioned above, I audiorecorded all but one of the interviews, and these digital-audio files have been systematically named, organized, copied/stored redundantly in case of accidental deletion or computer crash, and many times listened to, and, dare I say, enjoyed over the four years since conducted. All of these participants have gained warm places in my memory and even heart, though I will analyze my data, both primary and secondary, as dispassionately as I am able.

Transcription of Secondary Data

As a mechanism of thoroughness, I have, while carefully listening to all 10 recorded interviews and the one unrecorded interview, reviewed and embellished my handwritten interview notes from each interview, as I performed this complete audition of the entire set of interviews. While performing my data analysis, I have kept these embellished interview notes at hand, so that I can refer to them while considering analytic points involving the participants.

Subsequent transcription of the interview data has been performed on an as-relevant basis. As I located information from any given interview helpful toward supporting my analysis of a selected passage (or vice versa, finding interviewing segments that suggest fruitful moments for analysis, in the training), I have transcribed the relevant sections of that interview, using the same baseline of transcription detail—that is, including hesitations, repairs, pauses and the like, as can be seen in Appendix E.

Interviews and interview segments that are not used in analysis (because they do not bear upon discursive analysis of the primary data) I left untranscribed, though, as mentioned above, the written notes from these interviews have been kept close at hand throughout all analytic undertakings, and I have frequently re-listened to untranscribed passages, to better contextualize and understand passages that are transcribed.

Human Subject Protection

Prior to submitting my application for IRB approval for this project, I visited the University's Human Research Committee, to gain advice and guidance toward planning a research project and methodology likely to win approval. According to the university's IRB administrator for communication research, my IRB application served as our communication department's first successful completion of the new online application process. That time-saving innovation of technology took, I might add, about eight hours to get through. Thank God for Sundays (no pun). And, as the prospective researcher/applicant is conspicuously warned in multiple online screens, once the application is opened for completion, it cannot be paused/restarted. Eight hours later, the application was complete and submitted.

As it turned out, my project was an "easy pass" by IRB (aka, "Exempt" status granted; renewed each January for three consecutive years). Helping to secure approval was the fact that all the participants of this study were coming together for these training sessions, with or without my added-on research. Additionally, the proceedings of Dr. Porter's many highly-visible campus projects (such as the many and required TA training sessions she oversees) are routinely videotaped; people involved with her workshops know that to accept her invitation to work with her is to accept the likelihood of being

videotaped. Only my proposed interviewing added to the expectations in time and process for the project volunteers, and the interviews were expressly optional for the participants.

Lastly, though of critical importance, all recorded individuals of all meetings (save for a very few individuals who wandered in occasionally, seemingly lost, who never spoke and left soon after arriving), signed IRB-approved consent forms (see Appendix G), granting their consent that their discourse and interaction in this project may be analyzed as my research data for immediate work and eventually for the proposed dissertation.

Such concludes my presentation of my methodology, as relevant for both understanding and critical review of this study. I am proud to innovate in some small ways (e.g. the use of screen-shots to augment discursive data and also the employment of italics, as “attitudinal emphasis” in transcribed talk. More significantly, I present my forthcoming analysis with the added confidence of a researcher invited in, as things progressed, for active participation. This invitation, I assert, cannot help but to shed favorable light on my presumable ability to elicit meaningful data in both my session recordings (primary data) and, especially in my interviews. I was part of the group, and we all got along very amicably. That never hurts, and it also helps to explain a methodological stance I shall make clearer in analysis, that the researcher has available abundant opportunity to present analysis that does not dishonor those gracious enough to allow their talk and nonverbal interaction to be closely examined. Even in moments of tension and discomfort, I shall strive to meet this ideal, maintaining—and duly, per the aims of discourse analysis—a focus not on the individuals and personalities, but on the

roles and interactions that emerge, situationally, remembering the old saw “but, for the grace of God [and/or situational happenstance], there go I.”

CHAPTER 5:

DATA ANALYSIS, PART I: EXPLORING THE *DIALOGIC* (OR NOT) *SITUATION*

“The identity interactants want to convey and have confirmed depends on the situation they find themselves in.” – Miriam Locher (2004, p. 58)

Toward setting up the presentation and use, in Chapter 6, of my updated model for dialogic analysis of discursive interaction in contexts of teaching and learning, I first present, in this chapter, a situation-level analysis of my data, which were gathered during a semester-long, weekly (two hours per week, plus additional duties) training event of faculty development. Recall that this training event played out among a small crew of relatively high-profile and high-status personalities and various staff and assistants at a large, prominent western university, indeed, the largest university within a radius of some 500 miles. As has been discussed in detail, this site offers special advantages, in both setting and participants, toward informing practical understandings of dialogue in teaching in learning.

Of course, many situational elements could be singled out and brought to the fore, for the purposes of orientation for subsequent close inspection of discourse. A chapter such as this might attempt to identify and unpack “all” of the important definitional features of the larger situation that frames interaction to be studied. But, I argue, any attempt at exhaustive identification of all important and defining situational variables would be doomed to easy criticism as having left out not just *some* important variables,

but “the most important one.” Such is the breadth available in social theory, itself, and in discourse, in particular.

Even within the present methodological orientation of language and social interaction, that resting upon a metatheoretic stance of *communication as practice*, the range of perspectives in defining a situation is bounded only by the imagination and scope of the analyst. Indeed whatever variables one would (or would not) identify as “central” would merely serve, in a meta-analytic perspective, to locate the analyst’s biases—or, shall I say, *commitments*, for the two are close cousins if not identical twins. I have in chapters 1-4 outlined in some depth my theoretical commitments and their bases, as would be expected of a scholarly work such as this. As for my *ideological* commitments—or, shall I say, biases—now, *those* are not always spoken of directly, as such, by the scholar, yet they can scarcely hide themselves from view, especially to an observer standing upon a different ideological platform, that is, holding a different set of biases.

That said, I do not present the following situational unpacking as exhaustive, nor, necessarily, as the one, *proper* viewpoint. Rather, I intend to show and unpack the situation as I, having gathered my data first hand, as participant-observer, believe bears most relevantly upon the analysis to follow, while staying true to the theoretical commitments outlined, natural to biases seen to prevail, and appropriate for firm scholarly grounding of the discursive analysis to follow, which will examine discourse in terms of dialogue, toward understandings of teaching and learning. In particular, I argue that, for the participants in my study, the *central* situational variable in my event is one of motivation, of purpose, the answer, summarily, to the question, “Why are you

participating in this event?” To that focus, indeed, I am oriented and even biased, and I believe it a natural and practical bias for discourse analysis in pedagogical contexts: “Why are you taking this class?” Further, owing to the intention of practical theory, as proposed (Craig, 1999) and much and richly developed since by Craig and Tracy (as cited frequently throughout the preceding chapters), I seek to inform practice by keeping an eye out for *dilemmas*, as experienced by participants and best seen in difficult moments of talk, difficulties sometimes owing to competing values and ideals. For it is in these dilemmas that the readiest basis for informing practice can be analytically derived (Craig & Tracy, 1995; Tracy & Craig, 2010).

In the answer the “master situational question” proposed above—again, “Why are you in this class?”—as may be variously understood (or not) by individual in such a setting, be it a classroom, training room, or other formalized setting for teaching and learning, lies vital bases for understanding and interpreting, so to productively analyze, the discourse that arises in that educational setting. For this reason, my interviewing data, while presented in the larger scope of this work as secondary data, will figure prominently in this chapter’s examination of motives for attending. Likewise, my interviewing data will especially aid the identification of situational dilemmas that bear significantly upon the discourse to be analyzed in terms of the Pragmatics model, in Chapter 6. In exploring the situational question of motivation for attending, important corroborating clues are also available, analytically, within the discursive interaction that takes place in the training sessions, and such data from the sessions will be invoked where appropriate to aid analysis of interview segments.

Structurally, this chapter will begin with a more thorough examination of my selected situational focus of participant motivation. I then move to an examination of the professed motivations and purposes of the three faculty members, who serve as the “trainees” in this experimental project, and, considering these cases analytically, propose that a “pervasive” dilemma becomes evident, one that will bear centrally upon the discursive analysis of the event, both at the situational and interactional levels. The chapter then moves to a close examination of a pivotal moment, across the 12-week span of the project, in which I argue that *the situation becomes transformed*, especially in regards to dialogic analysis. The chapter concludes with analysis suggesting practical implications central for similar contexts and situations of faculty development training.

Situational Focus: *Participant Motivation*: “Why am I Participating in this Training?”

The analytic depth available, when regarding the motives—and motivations—of actors within any social setting is seemingly boundless. The depth and complexity of human “motives” has been well appreciated since Kenneth Burke (1945; 1950) established a language-based perspective on action, grounded in *motives*, particularly, in his view, motives arising in cycles of guilt and redemption. I nod to Burke but jump to the present, given the practical focus of my analytic method. That is, I seek to unpack not the complexities of human motivation, but to acknowledge, as primary variable within the dialogic situation, that participants have joined this, or any, project, for varying personal and institutional reasons. And these reasons for participating—whether taken directly, in terms of literally expressed participant motivations, or indirectly, through analytic exploration of participant responses, bear significantly, as I aim to show, upon

the nature of the prospective—and actual—discursive contributions that each participant is or is not inclined to make, during the training sessions.

This level of understanding begins with the participant's own answer to such interview questions as "Why did you join this project?" or, more open-endedly, "What is it like to be a part of such an event as this?" The latter, in fact, represents the actual, transcribed wording of how I first broached the subject of *personal motivation* in my opening interview (before making some modifications to my interview schedule), which began my series of 11 interviews with key project participants. It is important to bear in mind that my interviews were conducted about midway through this training event (during Weeks 4 through 6 of the semester).

Indeed, I do not mean to present, as "fact" or "truth," the responses of my interviewees, since, when interviewees respond to interviewer questions, many forces are at play, including face concerns, privacy concerns, lack of self-knowledge, desires to seem competent, and, as Tracy and Robles (2010) have recently explicated, dynamics of institutional positioning—different askers, in different roles, can expect to get different answers to similar interview questions. As Wengraf (2001) has outlined, the burden upon the qualitative researcher is not to accept, at face value, the responses of interviewees, but to render an *interpretation* of interview data. With that interpretive burden acknowledged, I move into analysis of my interview data, to inform selected segments of actual participant discourse during the training sessions.

That is, I will interweave, in the analysis to follow, things said during interviews with things seen and heard in the actual training sessions. My analytic goal is to explore and characterize participant responses, toward generalizing motivations that are available

for participation in the prospectively *dialogic situation* of faculty development and training. And in doing so, I aim further to identify and explore—as is appropriate when performing discourse analysis owing to the perspective of communication as practice—inherent and compelling dilemmas that become visible when contrasting what the interviewee *states* as his or her motivation against particularly telltale moments of talk that actually *happen* during the training sessions.

In the transcribed material to follow, in this chapter and next in Chapter 6, I, the researcher, am “MZ.” The transcription key used for both interviewing data and transcribed passages of the training can be consulted in Appendix A. General transcription processes are described in detail in Chapter 4. Stylistically, for ease of reading and review, I use paragraphing to break up longer speaking turns in the interviews and training session excerpts, which appear most fully in Appendix D, E, and F. I will regularly refer to these appended and fuller segments, but will pull from them and present, individually, selected sub-excerpts, as I examine, for analysis, the relevant passages, sometimes giving these in-text sub-excerpts, if more than just a few lines long, their own local line numbering. As mentioned earlier, I present, as Appendix F, a completely transcribed interview with one of the three professors (Peg) who participated in this training event, in order to characterize more fully the nature, tenor, and depth of these participant interviews.

Among the dozen or so regular participants in this study (the number of attendees varied week by week), I will focus this chapter’s examination of motivation and perspective (which I argue are definitional of the situation and bear significantly upon the data analysis in Chapter 6) mainly upon the three faculty participants, as they are the

pecially-designated “students” in this “Course on Course (Re)design,” as the project was billed. That is, recall, each of the three faculty were to come into this mock-course (the training, structured to emulate a university course) with a specific course to be redesigned, week by week, in light of the topical material of the week. Additionally, I will include, in my analytic scope, the perspective of one of the three graduate assistants (each faculty member had one funded graduate assistant), since this particular assistant, Julia (Ike’s assistant), played an especially active role in the seminar, partly, I presume, due to her external (to this project) association with the project director, NP, in related campus committee work.

First Faculty Case in Point: Ike, Professor in the Natural Sciences

As stated above, for my very first interview, among 11 conducted, I met with Ike, one of the three professors (he, in the natural sciences) who participated in this project. Ike served as my first interviewee because he responded well before any of the other participants did, following my group e-mail announcing that I needed to set interview dates with all who were willing to be interviewed. Because of Ike’s promptness in replying, his interview took place several days before any of the others, most of which occurred the following week, sometimes two per day.

This timing is significant to note, because Ike’s was the only interview to take place very soon (just two days) following a tumultuous exchange that transpired at the end of the Week-5 session. In other words, that incident (which I refer to as “Peg’s Protest” and will examine in close detail, including video screen shots, later in this chapter), was still quite fresh, perhaps uncomfortably so, during my interview with Ike, unlike the rest of my interviews, all of which took place following the buffering effect of

the Week-6 training session. In particular—toward setting up the forthcoming analysis of Ike’s motivations and other situational effects and impacts—one of the prime targets of Peg’s Week-5 post-meeting protest was the training’s often-discussed (*too-often-discussed*, in the view of all three faculty) “Kolb Model,” this being pedagogy theorist David Kolb’s (1984) “cycle of learning” and associated scheme of four distinct “learning styles.” The project director, NP, uses this model prominently in her university-wide program of TA training and related pedagogical outreach, such that the Kolb Model serves, one might say, as NP’s “pedagogical paradigm,” and, until Peg’s Protest, nearly every lesson through Week 5 had, in some way, involved this model, to the growing dismay of the three faculty, ultimately triggering the protest. With the special timing of Ike’s interview noted, I move onto description and analysis of the interview and Ike’s associated interaction during the sessions.

I conducted the late-afternoon interview in Ike’s small and somewhat cluttered office, located on the fourth floor—the top floor—of a prominent science building on campus. Allow me to paint the scene. I make my way toward the end of a long hallway that includes several doorways into large laboratory rooms, which I pass by, en route to Ike’s office. That is, Ike’s cramped office is situated right next to the top-floor labs, his stomping grounds. As I approach his open office door, I hear classical music playing, and, knocking at the door, I spot a dulcimer in one corner of the room and a radio perched atop one of several stacks of reading materials—books, binders, and unbound articles—all of which fill the small office, some stacked from the floor to head height. Ike, leaning back in his chair with one hand behind his head, as in repose, sees me and welcomes me in, and I pull from my backpack my interview schedule and voice recorder.

Because of the richness I perceived, during his reply to the general query that I used as a formal start of the interview—“How does it feel to participate in this? What is it like to be a *part* of such a thing?”—I made a quick note, as he spoke, that in subsequent interviews with other participants, I should ask, early in the interviews—and more directly—“Why are you participating in this project?” I hadn’t planned to ask Ike this question of motivation at all, actually, but as he delved into his philosophy of education, which migrated into his reasons for participating in this training event, the information, and also the rapport-building, seemed invaluable. So I made the note to myself to begin each subsequent interview with the direct query into reasons for participating, and this adaptation to my interview schedule I did make, formalizing the question, for the following interviews, as Question 1.

So the following interview excerpt (from Appendix E, Interview Excerpt 1.a) opens with Ike’s response to my opening query regarding the nature of the project itself, in his view. The second segment presented below, (from Excerpt 1.b) presents his response to a more-direct follow-up I’d asked regarding his motivation. In both cases, I will point out telltale contradictions between his actual discourse in the sessions and the motivations he espouses in the interview, motivations I will show as indicative of his “definition of the situation” (such that dialogue may or may not readily occur).

A Pervasive Dilemma in Faculty Development is Revealed

Ike, we know, is at home in the lab. His office is located right next to a whole row of doors leading into large labs. He naturally regards learning as an outcome of direct inquiry and experimentation, as he reveals in the open-ended beginning of our interview, as indicated in Interview Segment 1, lines 8-11:

Ike deep down, I just don't believe in anything
 except sort of a one-on- almost one-on-one-ish,
 sort of do-it-yourself kinds of education, right?

Given this stated orientation, laden, as it is with heavyweight qualifiers—such as “deep down,” “sort-of” (twice), “almost,” “one-on-one-ish,” and even the statement’s tag, “right?”—we can see that, in Ike’s view is that the best education unfolds not in a classroom setting, but more lab-like, “one-on-one-ish.” Ike’s stated motivation then, colored, perhaps, by some difficulties in stating it into a voice recorder, for the record, is not so much as student of classroom (or lecture hall) process, but as observer of how faculty training takes place presently. He is in this training, he asserts, primarily to gauge trends, in a sense to assess the market, for a book he may write. He wants to know, especially, what is *out there*, for good or bad, as regards current ideas and practices in pedagogy.

On the other hand, and remembering his need to show some semblance of solidarity as a member of this group, Ike makes two very telling comments in his continuation of the very response begun above. As seen below, first he acknowledges that, regardless of the style of interaction that one sees as the best mode of education (in his case one-on-one and experiential), to find out what other teachers do in possibly similar (or at least, analogous) situations holds a benefit of “efficiency” in the development of the teacher. The learning by experience is aided by tales of others’ experience, as he suggests below.

Furthermore, the passage below reveals what I believe holds vital clues as to what is arguably a pervasive dilemma of college faculty development, analogous to the

“power-full dilemma” I identified in the traditional college classroom (that dilemma being the tension between the student’s desire to speak with *authenticity*—which is one of the well-established, as necessary, conditions of Buberian dialogue (Buber, 1955; Cissna & Anderson, 2004)—in tension with the student’s need to *protect his or her grade*, by staying within the boundaries of what the teacher might find acceptable). What is this prospective pervasive dilemma for faculty development? I argue that it is embedded within the end of the utterance quoted below, from Interview Segment 5.1, lines 11-12:

1 Ike It’s like one of those things where it’s like
 2 weird to talk about it although it’s actually
 3 very helpful to sort of become aware of what
 4 you’re doing, because it’s more efficient. You-
 5 you become aware of things and faster, more
 6 efficiently than you do when you are sort of
 7 *stumbling* across these insights on your own. I
 8 mean- you know- part of it is because I come from
 9 a non- you know- I come from a sci- *science*
 10 background where nobody teaches you how to teach-
 11 ever. I mean like it’s considered inappropriate
 12 to be taught how to teach, right?

As Ike suggests, for a faculty member to need to be *taught how to teach* suggests a troublesome level of incomplete preparedness for that endeavor, a situation that may be especially problematic for faculty of notable institutional rank. The “*science* background” (lines 9-10) that he “comes from” necessarily provides a robust level of scholarly preparation, else he would not be employed by such a prominent university as is this one (as noted earlier, this is the largest institution of higher learning and research for 500 miles around). He has made it to quite a notable stage, as a scientist, but upon this stage,

teaching comes with the scientific role to be played. However, those performing upon this stage receive little substantive preparation for the teaching aspect of the role—no script, no director, and little, if any, rehearsal. The emphasis on teaching skills varies by university to university, and graduate students in the sciences, especially, are often funded as research, not teaching, assistants, so even at schools that feature a robust TA-training program, these research assistants (i.e., future faculty) can slip through the system untrained, specifically, to teach.

Yet, teaching, for the practicing scientist-scholar (like those in all disciplines), is somehow a *presumed* skill, and a risky presumption this is, as Ike points out: “right?” This “pervasive dilemma” in faculty training settings, I argue, likely constrains the discursive contributions—the talk, prospectively, the dialogue—that occurs during training, as the professor/trainee thinks, “I want to be a learner, but I need to show that I am already skilled.” One strategy, conscious or not, by which faculty might manage this tension—as I will further explore below, with analysis grounded in relevant literature—is to critique not only ideas presented in the training (“Oh that technique does not work for me” but also to critique the instruction, itself (“This training course could be taught much better”).

Observing the Dilemma through Ike’s Eyes

By definition, the “pervasive” nature of this inherent *situational* dilemma lies in its rootedness in conflicting participant values. By nature of their scholarly training, academics develop very tightly knit world views, and when these are violated, at some point or other, a space is opened for critique, and making such critique might mitigate some of the dilemmatic tension inherent in “I am being taught something I am already

supposed to know”). For example, consider the way that Ike rails for scientific processes, if not the scientific method, itself, to inform what training facilitators might propound as worthwhile pedagogical principles and practices. For Ike, *scientific method* grounds his epistemology as a scholar and researcher; hence, he wants to see this ideal, of critical thinking and hypothesis testing, also at work in the theory building of others, especially others who would purport to *teach him about teaching*. As regards meaningful, dialogue-fueling *difference* among the three faculty participants, Ike bears a conceptualization of knowledge—an epistemology—that, for the sake of validity, knowledge derives empirically.

Here is one quick excerpt, from Interview Excerpt 5.1b: (lines 158-163) in support of my point. Remember, this interview took place soon after the Week 5 uprising (in fact, just two days afterward), during which uprising, NP’s foundational “Kolb Model” took some serious hits, as we shall see in blow-by-blow detail, with screen shots, in a following section. Again, I present Ike’s point here as one example of this situational dilemma surfacing in talk, a dilemma that is both a barrier to—and spark for—dialogue, should the dilemmatic tension reach flashpoint.

13 Ike I never saw the Kolb before. And the Kolb’s okay,
 14 right? Uh, and it makes sense to me (pause)
 15 Uh- the question becomes- well what- you know,
 16 I’m not *that* interested in- you know- the idea
 17 that *all* four quadrants are equally valid-
 18 somebody would have to *prove* to me. ‘kay? So I-

It is important to show, as I argue for a “pervasiveness” of this dilemma—it can surface in many ways for different faculty—that Ike does not jump on the bandwagon of critiquing the Kolb model (and similar “educationese”) as irrelevant and wasteful of his

time, as Peg (and Dom) strongly believe. They have their reasons to “know better than the trainers, as to what should be taught,” and Ike has his. In fact, as photographic evidence reveals (see Screenshot 5.5) Ike tries to depart the scene as the uprising heats up. He needs no part of the anti-Kolb protest. Yet, although he “never saw the Kolb before” (he thusly creates some space for objective critique), he points out (and this is being said two days following the protest), “it makes sense to me.” The problem with the Kolb model is not that it is irrelevant, nor invalid, nor useless: to Ike, the problem is that it is *unproven*. In this way, Ike’s value system, prizing as he does scientific method, while differing from other values available for driving critique among other trainees (such as a felt need to stay up to date with technology), serves to illuminate the dilemma, as Ike experiences it. He might believe that the Kolb model is useful (given that all four of the model’s learning “quadrants” should, Ike says, *test out* as reasonably equivalent in learning *effectiveness*, but for that he will need evidence: “somebody would have to *prove* to me. ‘kay?”

Another Dilemma Revealed: To Act as Critical Scientist or Amiable Classmate

To hear Ike explain his reasons for participating, hence grounding, I argue, the *situation* in which he has placed himself, is that he is primarily there *to observe*, to gauge how educational research and related training looks and feels nowadays, since he has aspirations of becoming a voice in this arena, and, in fact, has already received considerable grant funding for exploring pedagogical innovations in the teaching of science, a fact he has brought up several times during training sessions. Consider Ike’s following responses, first to my original, open-ended query, then, a bit later in the

interview, to my direct question regarding his motivation for participating in this training project:

(From Interview Excerpt 1.a, in Appendix E, lines 1-14)

- 19 MZ How does it feel to participate in this?
 20 What is it like to be a *part* of such a
 21 thing? So that's my open-ended-
- 22 Ike Yeah, well it's weird. It- it *is* a weird
 23 thing because education is such a strange-
 24 uh area (pause) um- you know, I mean for-
 25 for me it's really (pause) it- it is really
 26 odd, because, really- deep down, I just
 27 don't believe in anything except sort of a
 28 one-on- almost one-on-one-ish, sort of do-
 29 it-yourself kinds of education, right? And
 30 where you learn and somebody talks to you,
 31 and then you learn yourself and somebody
 32 talks to you and whatever- or questions you-

(From Interview Excerpt 1.b, lines 149-15)

- 33 MZ What *was* your motivation for joining up with
 34 this project? It's a big- *time*- you know-
 35 eater for everybody-
- 36 Ike Well- it's 'cause I'm just interested in
 37 finding- I'm- I'm sort of trying to *learn*
 38 about what people do when they do this so I
 39 can get a real-time feel for what- what
 40 *passes* for education sort of research.
 41 'Cause I know these guys over in the College
 42 of Ed, too, you know- so- so I know people
 43 all over the place. So I'm- right now I'm
 44 just trying to get a *feeling* for you know-
 45 what *passes* for all these *things*, right?

An important function of the close textual reading required of discourse analysis aimed at informing communication as practice is the recognition of moments of discomfort evidently experienced by a speaker (Tracy & Craig, 2010). These can

sometimes be seen through such disfluencies as hesitations (unnaturally timed pauses), repetitions (stopping one's flow, then continuing, after all, by repeating the last word uttered before the break), and repairs (beginning to say one thing, interrupting oneself, and then continuing on by saying something else). Such breaks in fluency often indicate, or at least suggest, problematic moments, and these moments are of principal interest to the researcher seeking to unpack the communicative practices surrounding such moments of discomfort ((Tracy & Craig, 2010).

While I thereby acknowledge the importance of discursive disfluency, I must also note, having transcribed a considerable amount of talk from Ike, that special care must be taken, in his case, to identify moments of actual discomfort, since this speaker's utterances are routinely marked by regularly occurring hesitations and repairs—such is simply his natural speaking style. As a further disclaimer, sometimes repairs and repetitions simply function to allow the speaker time to think of what to say next (Cameron, 2001), since speakers must construct their messages in real time. Still, by closely examining the content and considering the nature of individual instances of hesitation and repairs, indications of discomfort can surface in analysis, and Ike's demonstrated need to recast what he is saying will indicate, in some cases, what would seem to be the sense of discomfort, even dilemma—that is, of competing interests with no easy resolution: of difficult choices to be made, none wholly satisfactory.

When for example, Ike corrects himself in saying, in lines 36-37), "I'm just interested in finding- I'm- I'm sort of trying to *learn about*," I would hesitate to infer, from that repair, some significant problematic issue or discomfort, although it is interesting to notice that Ike does retouch the coloration of

his motivation in terms of “learning,” instead of merely “finding-” (out?), which puts his motivation into a light perhaps more appropriate to a workshop in pedagogy. This is not a huge distinction, in my view, however.

In contrast, I argue for deeper implications of his repair and subsequent word choices at the end (lines 43-45) of that quoted utterance: “ So I’m- right now I’m just trying to get a *feeling* for you know- what *passes* for all these *things*, right?

By using the term “*passes* for,” a term he may or may not have initially been about to say—it does seem to flow smoothly from his point of hesitation, following “what”—he reveals a skepticism about the whole arena of educational research, or as he calls it, “education sort of research.”

With that point of transcription clarified, I return to the point I’m making: Ike might have said that he is participating in this training to observe, for his future use, the ways and means of current educational research and training; instead he speaks of what “*passes* for” education research—“sort of.” He is skeptical of education research, as he portrays in his opening comments in interview (lines 24-29), in which he states, “I mean for- for me it’s really (pause) it- it is really odd, because, really- deep down, I just don’t believe in anything except sort of a one-on- almost one-on-one-ish, sort of do-it-yourself kinds of education, right?”

Having spent more than 20 hours in a room with Ike, and rarely five minutes passing without his interjecting some pointed commentary or other (more of which, from both this interview and from related in-session contributions, shall be examined shortly),

it is clear that Ike has serious doubts as to the validity of the majority of educational research. That is not necessarily a dilemma. Ike might likewise doubt the validity of UFOs (or, in his discipline, Creationism) as well. Scholars, those in the hard sciences, especially, owing to what Craig (1999), citing Littlejohn and others, refers to as the hypothetico-deductive metatheoretical stance (in contrast to the metatheoretical stance Craig advances that is *normative*, as would, he argues, and this study aims to support, be more appropriate when viewing communication as a practical discipline), are not only allowed to, but are expected to, maintain a stance of reasoned skepticism and insistence upon data-driven, vigorous testing of hypotheses and assumptions.

Thusly, Ike's dilemma is not that he has doubts about the validity of educational research; Ike's dilemma of note right now is that which underlies his *talking about* such doubts as to the overall validity of the very program in which he is participating, while speaking on the record with a researcher who is recording the interview. It is his style as a scientist to answer factually, yet he must be careful about bad mouthing the program into a recording device, especially in light of Peg's Protest, which, as I described earlier (and will examine in depth later in this chapter), occurred just two days prior to this interview. The very validity, hence the viability, of this training event—hence of this prospectively *dialogic situation*—has been very seriously questioned. Yes, Ike needs to be careful, here and now, in how he couches his doubts as to pedagogical inquiry and theory.

Another complication in Ike's explanation of his motivation arises, as has been suggested earlier in this chapter, from the fact that institutional roles and responsibilities bear significantly upon how interviewees answer interviewer questions, as is demonstrated in Tracy and Robles (2010), whose school board members faced a dilemma

similar to Ike's in that "The interview treated the interviewee as a unique individual inhabiting a particular role and, at the same time, a spokesperson for her institution and someone whose words might be publicly reported" (p. 190). Likewise, Ike's every utterance during this recorded interview bears the risk of making it into print—as indeed this utterance has done!—along with a complicating factor of the well-understood relational closeness between the researcher and the program director, Nora Porter, a.k.a. NP. Anything that Ike might say to this researcher, whether or not seeing the light of day in print, bears the risk of making it to the ears of the NP, who wields enormous influence over pedagogical instruction on this campus, and that is an arena wherein Ike desires further participation and exposure.

The situational dilemma I am advancing is that, with just three faculty participating, the comments of any one of them bear significant weight: there is nowhere to hide. As a university scientist, Ike is obligated, epistemologically, to maintain a critical stance, honoring his role in what Palmer (1998) calls a "community of truth" (p. 95). Yet Ike faces additional and competing needs and obligations as a member of this small training event, which Wenger (1999) might call a "community of practice," and thusly require of the members both "participation and reification" (p. 264). These two ideas—and obligations—of community are not necessarily at odds; in fact, in a best-case scenario, they are one and the same. But in this case, we see that Ike is pulled between two competing interests: seeking and speaking the truth courageously, versus performing the identity-work of participation and reification, as a colleague, if not comrade in arms.

So Ike is torn between the institutional mandates of his position as a scientist on campus—one with both a right and an expectation, a duty, to maintain a scientifically

critical, or at least an appropriately skeptical, stance—and his social needs as a cooperative and likable member among the broader group of members of the university community who are oriented to pedagogical improvement: “‘Cause I know these guys over in the College of Ed, too, you know- so- so I know people all over the place.” By including himself in this broad but specific reference group, including not only “these guys in the “College of Ed,” (actually this university unit is named the School of Education) but, more broadly, “people all over the place,” Ike positions himself as a like-minded associate, a faculty member concerned with educational improvement, that is, a good guy. If he is a critic of “what *passes* for educational research,” he is at least a friendly critic, a fellow among the group.

The direct question I posed, regarding Ike’s motivation, further supports analysis pointing to a sense of dilemma, in this matter, as can be seen in his nonfluent response, where “finding (out)” is repaired, herky-jerky into “trying to learn about,” and educational research becomes “what *passes* for education sort-of research.” He summarizes and concludes his response to my question about his motivation to participate, saying, “So I’m- right now I’m just trying to get a *feeling* for you know- what *passes* for all these *things*, right?” The repair that inserts “right now” serves to soften his critique (there is knowledge he lacks, and this program will presently help with that, however valid (or not) the material and even its larger perspective may be, in total, “what *passes* for all these *things*, right?”

And yet, it is not a particular fad or philosophical, political, or even pedagogical stance that irks Ike, as we see play out in much of the ongoing debate about education reform, where constructivist ideals and a related focus on learner self-esteem and participation are thrown up against a back-to-basics approach that calls for a return to nonsense instruction (i.e., “direct” or “explicit” instruction) and standardization of learning outcomes and measurements, a debate well engaged in a series of scholarly essays edited by Tobias and Duffy (2009) in their recent book (aimed mainly at the teaching of science), *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?* Not surprisingly, those editors, in summarizing the pro and con arguments housed in the volume, conclude that it would appear that it is a balance of both styles that is most effective. Regardless, Ike speaks of his own position, one that falls outside of both of the well-worn, polar stances explored and contrasted in Tobias and Duffy (2009).

As constitutive of the situation at hand, the two stances (constructivism versus direct instruction) function as prefabricated, ready-to-go “tropes” of pedagogical meaning, akin to “little-d discourses” as discourse analysts such as Gee (1999) might call them. This I point out to further support my smaller-scale view of the dialogic situation—against larger, macro views of institutional, even societal, talk, which Gee and others call Big-D discourses, the kind that interests Alexander (2005) and also analysts in the critical discourse analysis (CDA) tradition. Consider, if I might coin a name for an exemplification of Big-D discourse, the environmentally-aimed talk that could be called “Green-Speak.” That is Big-D. I am after little d.

This is an important distinction, given that the larger aim of this study is to theorize the engagement of difference, idealized as a means toward breaking out of traditional tropes and clichés, as regards understanding dialogue in teaching and learning. What bothers Ike, as is seen earlier in the interview, prior to answering the question as to his motivation for joining the project, is his larger skepticism regarding *all* forms of curriculum-driven and overly prescribed instruction. He may have something novel, even radical, to say. The question is, will (or can) he articulate it, in the group environment, and, if he does, will the group embrace, engage, or even build upon it? I am not taking sides, as analyst, only noting a nontraditional discourse in the rare moment of its appearance, one that falls outside the typical range, outside the customary dichotomy and debate. Perhaps the group will, instead, ignore or even rebuke this difference or, to give it a French accent, if not a capital initial, this embodiment of Derrida's *différance*! We shall see.

Dom Confirms the Situational Dilemma

To distill, in situations where academics are gathered for training and collaboration as teachers, such as the case in faculty training, the “students” are already practicing professionals, if untrained, whose experience plays a central role in the training efforts toward professional development (Berry, 2007; Loughran, 2006) and who, moreover, carry both badge and burden as public intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). This combination of competing needs can present dilemmas, indeed, as will next be shown, not in interview data, but this time in the actual training setting, starting with the

following exchange between Ike, whose interview has been explored above, and Dom, another of the three tenured faculty are participating, he, a professor in the humanities.

Training Session Excerpt 1 (transcribed, with line numbers, in Appendix B), which will be next examined, involves an exchange that occurred near the end of the very first project meeting. Note that this initial training session is the only session that was held in Pelham Hall, prior to the project's Week-2 relocation to the Center of Technology (COT) building. This first day, the action is happening in a Pelhams Hall computer lab, where participants cannot see each other very well, with large, flat-screen computer monitors at every seat. In the following exchange, as the initial training session is winding down, most of the participants have introduced themselves and discussed their interests in the program. Emma, a technical expert who had worked with the project leader, NP, in developing the training course (but who quickly became a marginal player, rarely appearing after this first session) and Dom had just finished a brief exchange in which Emma had promised an array of technological course content, and Dom had replied jokingly, "so it's more than learning WebCT" (then, the online course-support platform of the university).

Following a conversational lull of about 10 seconds, Dom takes the floor, changing the subject markedly, by inquiring whether the training will include discussion of "philosophies" of education, an ironic query, given the revolt that would later happen over "too much educationese," as Dom eventually names it in his interview. Too much of anything can be a problem, fair to say, but the point is that, here, in this first meeting, most of the talk has involved technology, and Dom is calling for more than just that. As the excerpt shows, in making his query, Dom mentions by name a legendary lecturer at

the university, and Ike takes exception to the central proposition inherent in Dom's question.

- 1 Dom Are we gonna be discussing any of- the
 2 *philosophy* of- what we're doing- behind all
 3 this? Something came up that Ike just said
 4 that I have a question about. I know we're
 5 in an interactive age, and I've seen, you
 6 know, quite a few of the studies-
 7 interaction and clickers is critical [NP: m-
 8 hmm], but I can't help but thinking of Bob
 9 Smith. I don't know if you knew Bob Smith
 10 [NP: I loved Bob Smith], who was our
 11 greatest lecturer ever. [NP: yep- yep] And I
 12 don't know what students got out of the
 13 class, [Ike: well they just-] but he could
 14 make them cry and laugh, and he was just
 15 great- and they remember that 30 years [NP:
 16 yep] later.
- 17 Ike They remember the *emotion*. The question is,
 18 are they being thought- are they being
 19 taught to think critically about the
 20 problem. I mean there's a- there *is* a
 21 tendency to think that people who are
 22 *entertaining* are educating. And- the
 23 evidence in- in physics education research-
 24 is the- that it's- it's *instructor*
 25 independent. Great lecturers, bad lecturers,
 26 it doesn't make *any* difference when you
 27 actually come down to understanding things
 28 conceptually, and- and I *wonder* whether the-
 29 the- the sort of *environment* of the
 30 university doesn't favor entertainment over
 31 education. . .

Recall that we are looking for insights into situational dilemmas that Ike—or any faculty—faces in the setting of faculty development training. When Dom, following a brief lull in the group conversation, opens the above exchange by questioning NP about

non-technical prospective course content—that is, of “the philosophy” underlying effective teaching—he is legitimizing the non-technical side of college teaching, skills in lecture, in particular. As I will discuss later, Dom, himself, answered my interview question regarding his motivation for participation in this project in terms of wanting, even needing, to stay up to date with educational *technology*. Therefore, it is especially revealing that he would make a comment that runs contrary to his own espoused motivation for participating in this project.

Privately (in our interview, which, notably, took place almost a month following this first session) Dom readily portrays this awareness of the importance of technology and the importance of his upgrading his repertoire as regards technology. Perhaps it is what transpired in that first month of the training—namely a marked *absence* of technology training—that inclined him to answer thusly; but for now, in this first session, where participants are getting acquainted with one another, Dom makes this move, which distinguishes himself and his interests, of pointing to the importance of lively lecture techniques (lines 4-9 above): I know we’re in an interactive age, and I’ve seen, you know, quite a few of the studies—interaction and clickers is critical [NP: m-hmm], but I can’t help but thinking of Bob Smith.

In this excerpt, we see Dom’s acknowledgment that “we’re in an interactive age” and his nonspecific reference to “quite a few of the studies” that show the importance of interaction and “clickers” (hand-held devices by which students interact with a receiving computer that tabulates student responses and can then display the data upon a screen in front of the classroom, usually, if clickers are used, a lecture hall). Dom is up-to-date

with the times, so it would seem, and has even read the articles espousing “interaction” (in contrast to lecture). However, this currency with the times creates space for Dom to then extol the virtues of good, old-fashioned lecture, without seeming outdated. He has paid homage to the well understood, and even pressing, mandates of technological currency, and yet he “can’t help but” to recall a beloved former faculty member, Bob Smith (a pseudonym), whose reputation hinged not on technology, but on the least technological and interactive mode of course content delivery of them all: lecture.

The phrase “can’t help but” is loaded with implications of judgment; it is in fact a brilliant marker of dilemma. If only he could help himself, he would not notice that a lecturer (in opposition to someone who would use technology, such as clickers, or something else that would function in an interactive mode) would hold such a revered place in university history. And NP, the project director, quickly affirms the value of this nontechnological stalwart: “I loved Bob Smith.” She can’t help herself either. In the face of a presumable embrace of technology, both Dom and Nora “can’t help” themselves but to notice that an old-fashioned lecturer stands among the most brilliant of remembered faculty.

None of the participants in this exchange is commenting that Bob Smith lacked technology, that his nontechnical methods would not pass muster by today’s standards, even as Ike complicates Dom’s point vociferously, citing (nonspecific) research of his own (lines 22-28 above): And- the evidence in- in physics education research- is the- that it’s- it’s *instructor* independent. Great lecturers, bad lecturers, it doesn’t make *any*

difference when you actually come down to understanding things conceptually.

The question then arises, why would Ike, a professor, downplay the importance of the oratory skill of the professor, in favor of a not-yet-articulated methodology of producing the desired learning? Just as Dom, who worries about keeping up with technological mandates regarding his job, nonetheless “can’t help but thinking of” a revered lecturer, in the face of impending technological training, Ike, so to speak, “can’t help but” deny the importance of lecture skill, period, directing his scientific attitude instead toward the sheer achievement outcomes, by whatever means. He is not contesting that lecture could be effective, though nontechnological, but he’s advancing a related point: somehow or other, the achievement of desired learning outcomes does not hinge on the effectiveness of the teacher. And the pervasive dilemma again surfaces, if in a different form: “It’s okay if I don’t know some of the coming material, since learning is ‘teacher independent.’”

Dom was only my second interviewee, but I did make a point—having learned from my first interview, with Ike, to ask him, with my initial interview question (after about two and a half minutes of small talk), why he had elected to participate in this program. In contrast to what we just heard, in the first session, from Dom, who could not help himself but to notice the skill of Bob Smith, star lecturer, his stated purpose for attending this training program is to upgrade his technological skills, which he frames as a primary, if not *the* primary basis for teaching effectiveness, as seen, if with a problematic rationale, in the following segment, taken from lines 21-55 of Interview Excerpt 3.

For the sake of continuity, I present the majority of his response in one segment, below; following that, I will analyze it in separate parts.

1 MZ Okay. What was your motivation for joining this
2 group?

3 Dom Umm- *that* was very clear. Um- I wanted to learn
4 the *technology*. I wanted to learn- I want to
5 keep my- a- *teaching*- methods uh- as- as current
6 as they can be. And I think the technology is
7 the *key* to that. I want to- um- I want to be
8 able- m- y'know, it's- it's interesting-
9 somebody said it today about the- what was it,
10 the 70 percent is communications and [MZ: yeah,
11 on the video] I fully agree with that.

12 Now I'm- I'm- I'm one of the rare ones in my
13 department who believes that- they believe it's
14 all content. But when I was chair of the
15 department I'd tell people who were having
16 trouble- ((assistants)) you can't communicate-
17 you're brilliant- you're smarter than I am- I
18 said, but I can go into a lecture and I can get
19 the message across- and you ain't.

20 I don't care how *smart* you are- if you can't
21 *communicate*, whether it's jumping up and down,
22 whether it's making them cry, whether it's- you-
23 So I agree with that and I th- and I'm
24 *wondering*- one of my motivations *beyond* trying
25 to remain up to date and modern was a thought
26 that are students learning differently? Now I've
27 given Nora a very hard time about how much, as
28 I've called it, educationese is in the class.
29 And I'm not- I'm not really that interested in
30 that. But I'm- but I *do* appreciate the fact that
31 *maybe* when I get up in lecture, it's not like it
32 was fifteen years ago.

Dom answers the question of his reason to participate with one key word:
technology. Notice how technology is immediately linked to “keeping teaching methods

as current as they can be”; it is “the *key* to that.” In contrast, education professionals who specialize in pedagogy training, such as the program director, NP, might *include* technology as an important element, but technology is surely not the only, nor even principal, aspect of “keeping current” in one’s teaching, as this very study purports to embody, seeking as it does *dialogue in teaching and learning*, not some electronic innovation.

It is dilemma that we seek, however, and it is dilemma that we find. No sooner does Dom identify the central importance of technology, he then has trouble articulating the next sentence in support of that position (lines 7-10): I want to- um- I want to be able- m- y’know, it’s- it’s interesting- somebody said it today about the- what was it, the 70 percent is communications.” Dom’s hesitations and disfluencies cannot be missed above, marking, as they do a breach in the flow of his articulation, of his substantiation of technology as his primary interest. Ironically, he finishes his thought, once he is able to muster some momentum, in terms of not technology, but “communications” as the element of central import to effective teaching, a point he cites from the training session conducted earlier in the day, then punctuating his observation (line 11) with, “I fully agree with that.” The question I would pose, in analysis, is this: *to what* is he is “fully agreeing”? He has in fact just contradicted himself: first he says his motivation is to learn technology, so as to stay current in his craft, and now he is “fully agreeing” with the proposition that it is not technology, but communication upon which teaching effectiveness hinges. He seems to be conflating, at this moment of self interruption,

technology and communication. Indeed the two are intertwined, but that is scarcely the point he is pressing.

He then amplifies this self-contradiction by referencing his position as department head, clearly an act of legitimation of his stance. In fact, in this supervisory role, he has been, he states, compelled to point out to struggling faculty in his department the importance of not technology (nor expertise), but communication (lines 17-22):

"You're brilliant- you're smarter than *I* am- I said, but I can go into a lecture and I can get the message across- and you ain't. I don't care how *smart* you are- if you can't *communicate*, whether it's jumping up and down, whether it's making them cry. . . ." Tellingly, Dom's portrayal of competence involves going into a lecture and getting a message across, not some whiz-bang deployment of technology.

We see, further, this tension, this dilemma, in which technological modernity ("keeping up-to-date") is juxtaposed with teaching effectiveness (and we have Ike to remind us that little has developed there since the time of Socrates!). The tension shows in Dom's juxtaposition of his admission of his critiqued underling's brilliance (the underling is smarter than Dom, indeed the department chair) but also ineffectiveness, against Dom's effectiveness, if professedly less brilliant. For emphasis, Dom casts this point with a lowering of formality, through the colloquial, but pointed, "and you ain't." This switch of register effects a sense of plain talk, not of a high horse, though dutiful critic Dom must be. He does not indicate nor bemoan a lack of brilliance; the accentuated way (shown in italics) in which he speaks the word "I" in the phrase, "smarter than *I* am,"

is hardly self-flagellation; the implication is that, although the underling is *even* smarter than Dom, no amount of smarts can assure communication competence in the lecture hall—it is an anecdote about communication, although presented, as it began, as support for the importance of technology, Dom’s one-word reason for attending this training event. Why the mid-stream switch of horses in this illuminating moment of our interview? What is the dilemma underlying? I argue that the dilemma arises from wanting to teach well, knowing that such centers upon communication, and yet feeling the pressure to keep up with technology, which was little needed by Socrates, except as an indication of staying “up-to-date.”

Under this tension, Dom, while progressing through his answer to my question about his motivation for joining this training, moves his stance away from his own initial, direct answer, which named technology as “clearly” (as he put it) his main interest in the training. In so wandering, it has not taken very long, actually, for him to “wonder” his way to this point: and I’m *wondering*—one of my motivations *beyond* trying to remain up to date and modern was a thought that, are students learning differently? He is wondering aloud and, it would seem, productively. His immediate (hence not-yet-reflective) response to the question of his motivation is “Um— I wanted to learn the *technology*” (emphasis, his). As he now develops his answer in more detail, influenced by his own recounting of the “and you ain’t” story of the chastised underling, he brings himself to the point of wondering whether students are learning differently *nowadays* (emphasis mine). I will next explore the possibility that “nowadays,” itself, is a word that functions powerfully, as a discursive resource for managing the pervasive dilemma of faculty development. If

so, it should reveal a compelling clue toward deciphering, essentially, this larger *situation*, that is, this prospectively *dialogic situation*.

Peg Likewise Wonders, “I Can Teach Just Fine, but am I Ready to Teach Students
Nowadays?”

Indeed there is a lot of talk about technology, when the faculty in this study discuss their motivations for participation. Technology is the immediate answer of Dom, when asked about his motivations, and it is a keen interest of Ike, though he will want proof of its effectiveness. I now call to the witness stand Peg, the third of the three faculty participants, whose pivotal protest during Week 5 shall be closely scrutinized in the following analysis. There, I will show the centrality of technology as a compelling, even driving, interest, within Peg’s frame of reference. For present purposes, these of affirming the salience of the value identified above, that of “teaching effectiveness,” I will look to Peg’s response to the question of motivation as well as map this response to another key moment within the sessions (and not delve into her prominent protest—yet).

The complete transcript of my interview with Peg is shown at the end of this dissertation as Appendix F, where it serves to exemplify, more completely, the set of interviews, as regards the tenor, topic, scope, and other features of the interviews. The following excerpts from this interview include two segments containing material indicating Peg’s motivation for participating. Here is the first excerpt in which Peg makes her explanation that the main reason she joined this project was out of an obligation to NP that developed from somewhat offhand comments made when the two were at a

conference together months earlier. She had obligated herself, without necessarily remembering that she had done so (from lines 87-101 in Appendix F)

1 Peg And I'm pretty sure it must have been in the
2 context of some of those conversations that
3 she mentioned this project and said "Do you
4 wanna take a part in it?" or something like
5 that and I actually don't remember anything
6 specific, other than, I think that's what
7 happened. And then I think December ended
8 with the usual craziness of graduation, and
9 this and that, and at some point, I think
10 there was an e-mail from Nora, where she
11 said "Do you remember when you said you'd
12 want to be in this?" And I thought what-
13 what is it that I said, and so I just kind
14 of said, oh yeah, remind me, and she said
15 oh, okay. So that's how. It was- the short
16 answer is through a connection to Nora.

So the initial motivation for Peg's joining the project was a sense that she had obligated herself, although, in the way that she presents her recollection (lines 12-14), she indicates that her "commitment" made at the conference may have been more in Nora's mind than in her own: "And I thought what- what is it that I said, and so I just kind of said, oh yeah." Contrast this to Ike's response, that he wanted to see how this kind of pedagogical theory and training looks presently, and Dom's response, which was first an emphasis on wanting to learn technology and then, further into in his answer, an acknowledgment of the need for a better understanding of how students learn *nowadays* (arguably this is also linked to technology). For Peg, the reason is social obligation. I did ask a follow-up question,

however, as regards her perception of the purpose of the workshop. The following excerpt is taken from lines 117 to 148 of Appendix F:

- 17 MZ Okay (pause) what did you know about the purpose
18 of this?
- 19 Peg Well, not that much- but the word technology was
20 in there, and I think it was in my mind, you
21 know, you'll learn how to use more technologies
22 and apply them to your classes.
- 23 MZ Okay, did you have personal motivations to learn
24 that, so that this could be a goal of yours- that
25 I'll not only help with the project but I want to
26 learn those kinds of things?
- 27 Peg You know, I'm in the applied communications
28 school, and so it's kind of like you're saying,
29 oh the methods class from the '80s to now is
30 really changing, well I mean, the field is really
31 changing dramatically, and some things kind of
32 remain, for example, if you're teaching students
33 how to write or how to do an interview or how to
34 um, you know, take content and deliver it to an
35 audience. There are some things that stay the
36 same. But all that stuff that we had demonstrated
37 on Wednesday. All that was not, in any way, part
38 of a newsroom, when I was an intern, and now it's
39 all part of a newsroom. So yes, the motivation on
40 the part of any applied communication teacher to
41 be more adept to learn more and all of that is-
42 it should be- very motivating.
- 43 MZ And for you it is?
- 44 Peg I mean I'm looking at all this stuff and
45 thinking. I can use some of this. I could have
46 them take some video image is with their stories
47 I could have them do this. I could have them do
48 all of that.

What is important to note, above, is that Peg is making reference to what she appears to have seen as a very valuable session, one that had just taken place, a couple

days prior to the interview, in Session 6, the one that followed her protest at the end of Session 5. Again this protest-event will be explored in depth in the following section. As for her pre-project understandings as to the purpose of the workshop, she remembers things this way (line 19-22): “Well, not that much— but the word technology was in there, and I think it was in my mind, you know, you'll learn how to use more technologies and apply them to your classes.”

So the idea of wanting to update her technology-in-the-classroom skills is clearly present, along with her social obligation to participate, yet when we look closely at how she presents this motivation we see some wavering: it is not necessarily that she wants to learn this, but that she feels that a professor in her field *should* bring him or herself up to date, as shown in the movement from “is” (motivating) to “should be” motivating (lines 39-42): “So yes, the motivation on the part of any applied communication teacher to be more adept to learn more and all of that is— it should be— very motivating.”

This movement in her espoused motivation, from what it is to what it should be, gives us clues as to what is underlying her desire, or at least willingness, to learn technology: what she wants actually to do is to gain—and also portray—competence as an instructor. In terms of what I am calling a pervasive dilemma in this *situation* of faculty development, an interesting twin effect is surfacing. Faculty members, especially we might surmise, tenured faculty, given their longevity and status, are being trained in something—pedagogy—that they are supposed to already understand at an expert level but were not likely directly trained, so as to possess the presumed mastery. However

there is no expectation—nor could there be—that a faculty member might pre-learn, during training or during experience, understandings as end-users of *technology*, which is ever unfolding.

This understandable need to become updated as regards technology, if not teaching methods, presents a precious entrée—a legitimate reason for attending faculty development training. This helps explain why, on top of what I’ve argued as a strongly held value of teaching effectiveness, the stated motivation, for both Dom and Peg, for participation in this event is to learn technology. Ike’s response is likewise a cloak: he said he wants to see what passes for education training these days, and this does seem reasonable, just as it seems reasonable that Peg and down want to learn new developments in technology. Their stated reasons surely hold some amount of legitimacy, perhaps a vast amount. But the ideal situated at the core of this practice—collegial participation and faculty development—I argue is the same for all three professors.

These participants do not state that their need is to become better teachers, nor would they be expected to comfortably make this confession, given their status as full, tenured professors. Returning, for a moment, to Dom’s interview, we see this tension between what is perceived as needed and what may be expressed as needed, once again play out quite vividly:

Dom	Now I’ve given Nora a very hard time about how much, as I’ve called it, educationese is in the class. And I’m not- I’m not really that interested in that. But I’m- but I <i>do</i> appreciate the fact that <i>maybe</i> when I get up in lecture, it’s not like it was fifteen years ago.
-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Dom is not, he says, interested in “educationese” (aka the Kolb Model) and this, too, will be seen more directly, as we examine Peg’s protest, below. With a little difficulty “But I’m– but I *do* appreciate,” he does acknowledge that there are things he could learn, as regards teaching students today. That is, although faculty are hesitant to acknowledge needs for educationese (a.k.a. learning theory, whether the Kolb model or any other pedagogical framework or technique, including, I would note, dialogue in teaching and learning), the opening for admission of need, as a temporal one: the need to know how to teach *nowadays*, which of course could not have been part of their foundational preparation and training for the job.

Flashpoint: “Peg’s Protest” Sparks Dialogue, from Situational Tension

From interviewing data and personal observation, I find it safe to assert, in opening this section of analysis, that NP, the project leader, is a leading and respected educational authority on campus, who had no idea she was going to be blindsided, by “the force of technology,” as she directs and participates in this program of faculty development. Yes, the project was funded expressly as an effort, to be jointly conducted through her program of campus-wide TA-Training in conjunction with the greater Center of Technology project on campus. And, yes, the COT building, itself, was, during the time of this data gathering, a brand-new (some peripheral construction still ongoing) and very costly building on campus, constructed expressly to serve as the new central hub for numerous technology initiatives at the university.

Therefore, NP and everyone else helping to develop the project expected that there would be a *technological* focus to this “course in course-redesign,” as NP routinely referred to this project. But neither Nora, her staff, nor I (who had been included in

several hours of pre-project brainstorming and strategizing, sometimes in small groups, sometimes one-on-one with NP) had expected the prominent outward resistance, among the faculty participants, against learning the *non*-technological aspects of course redesign, especially learning-styles theory—in particular, the four-styles model of David Kolb, which received significant and repeated emphasis.

Importantly, in the third meeting, two weeks prior, some concerns had been raised (by the faculty members) regarding the desire for a greater course focus on technology. Nora (NP) had asked, Week 3, for input, and she received plenty: “More technology, please!” NP promised to follow-up on that input, and, indeed, she had followed up, promptly and demonstrably, as evidenced in revised scheduling information (akin to a revised course syllabus) that she disseminated the very next week (Week 4). As her casual (and, as it turns out, premature) adjournment of the Week 5 session reveals below, little did she suspect that the changes she had made Week 4 were not being viewed, by the faculty anyway, as nearly substantive *enough*. The faculty members still wanted far *more* technology and far *less* learning theory.

Dialogic Turning Point of the Training Program

Moving now into analysis—with screen shots—of this much-referenced (in numerous participant interviews, especially) turning point of the training event being studied, we pick up the discursive action very near the conclusion of the fifth two-hour training session (Week 5) in this semester-long series. Aided, as promised in Chapter 4, by visual support by way of imbedded screenshots, I begin analysis with the following excerpt taken from the opening lines Training Session Excerpt 4, as presented in Appendix D:

- 1 Nora (NP) So anyway. Okay, well, we need to wrap up. But
 2 you get the idea.



Screenshot 5-1: NP moves to dismiss the class at the end of Week 5.

There is an irony here, as it is NP who does not yet (apparently) “get the idea” that at least some of the group members are frustrated with the material just presented. Here is where Peg, one of the three professors in the group, makes the unexpected move of initiating some discussion regarding her pressing concerns. Hence, the first point I would make, in examining the Peg Incident, is the very timing of this protest and ensuing series of exchanges, which we find occurring at the very end (at 10:55 a.m.) of the two-hour session set to end at 11. The discontent has evidently been bottled inside Peg up for two hours; now, out it pops: “flashpoint” is reached.



Screenshot 5-2: As NP dismisses class and Martin, far left, is caught in a yawn, Peg, third from far right, surprises the group by interrupting the class dismissal, initiating a discussion of her concerns.

- 3 Peg Before we wrap up, can I just raise one thing,
 4 which is uh issues of technology. I'm actually a
 5 little worried that things that I thought were
 6 gonna happen are not gonna happen. Like I wanted
 7 to know how to do a *podcast* and I wanted to know
 8 how to do this, that, and the other and=
 9 Vijay =podcasts are coming up, right?
 10 NP Yeah. Were actually gonna do a podcast=
 11 Peg =Anyway, I'm just- can- can we have a brief
 12 discussion [NP: Yeah] about this [NP: Yeah] *part*
 13 of [NP: Yeah] things

Let us recall that the group has just participated in (or, depending upon perspective, sat through or even endured) nearly two full hours of the very “educationese” that was criticized in the feedback requested Week 3. Another two hours have come and gone, with precious little of the hands-on technology training requested. Peg knows—having exchanged a series of e-mails with Dom (as became clear during participant interviews, the two discussing “offline” the situation of too much

educationese and not enough technology; these e-mails spoken of in both parties' interviews—that Dom shares with her the concerns she is about to raise. This may be the single most important moment of the 12 weeks of training sessions, as regards the definition of the situation, so I will now take a very close look at the brief passage, aiming, among other analytic purposes, to show the function of politeness (both in the everyday sense and in the sense of politeness theory) as an essential element during this pivotal, situation-redefining moment in the project.

In this exchange, we see that Peg raises her concern, aided by subtleties of language that soften the potential offensiveness of her challenge. As I will show below, Peg's buffering of surprise remarks serves to minimize the risk of her challenge as functioning as a face threatening act. Both aspects of face (Brown & Levinson, 1987) are at risk in the classroom when a student makes a move toward open critique of the program, as is now happening in our transcript. Peg wants to seem reasonable to other classmates (and, thusly, has been conferring privately with Dom about this issue), and she also wants the freedom to voice her concern, unimpeded, to use Brown and Levinson's term. NP, in the same vein, wants her project to proceed, *unimpeded*, and also wants her curriculum to pass the test of the challenge—to show itself to the group as a reasonable plan, one that, in fact, already includes plans for a lesson in podcasting.

It should be noted that Brown and Levinson warn that, during moments of "affrontery" (and in some other situations, such as urgency), "face can be, and routinely is, ignored" (p. 312). But we know, through interviewing data, that Peg's very reason for participation in this program arises from interpersonal connections with NP—the two women had discussed and exchanged holiday recipes, having met up, by chance, at an

out-of-state convention. Therefore, with personal relationships in the mix, as well as institutional ones, we can expect face concerns to remain in focus, “affrontery” notwithstanding.

In the transcript (lines 3-8), Peg’s demonstration of politeness, albeit during protest, starts when Peg opens by echoing NP’s own words (“wrap up”) and, then before voicing her concern, seems to ask permission (“can I just raise one thing”), a move of deference to the teacher. Her challenge is further softened by the use of the minimizing term “little,” in “I’m a little worried.” Naming the specific example of a “podcast” further depersonalizes this challenge to the teacher’s authority: she is not attacking the teacher; she is naming a desired learning topic. However, including “this, that, and the other” diminishes this effect, showing some contradiction between her desire for politeness and respect and her swelling frustration level. She *wants* to show respect, but she *needs* to bring about change, else her continued participation will seem wasteful of her valuable time.

We should pause to remember that, in general, all conflict in the classroom is markedly dispreferred, especially by teachers (Canary & MacGregor, 2008) but also by students. Indeed, in their recent study of teacher perceptions of preferred/dispreferred student communication styles and patterns, Canary and MacGregor (2008) list “confrontational” as one of the three major categories of undesirable student communication that emerged in the categorization of their research data. (The other two categories of undesirable student communication that emerged in their study are “absent” and “silent.”) Further, Manke (1997) discusses and exemplifies certain “politeness formulas” that teachers use expressly to quell incipient conflict, since direct statements

(such as “Sit back down”) will tend to exacerbate, not extinguish, the budding conflict.

One teacher in Manke’s study referred to such confrontation with students as “the realization of her worst fears” as a teacher. In short, research evidence (and common sense) strongly suggests that teachers do not, as a rule, wish to be “confronted” in front of the class.

Nor, Manke (1997) furthers, do students, themselves, desire episodes of teacher-student conflict to take place during class, seeing such events as misbehavior that stands out starkly in a setting especially framed upon the idea of appropriate demeanor. Acting appropriately is seen as particularly important where students are being taught a subject, and, in parallel, being educated in how one ought to act, in group settings, generally. Even among older students, including adults, classroom conflict seems to indicate that something is wrong (Mahoney, 2008); seemingly, leadership is breaking down. A classroom brouhaha feels bad, in all directions, and it is generally undesired by all parties. In fact, Manke finds, as does Cazden (2001), that incidents of outward classroom conflict are quite rare events, indeed, often occurring only once, if at all, in various classrooms observed over time. Therefore, when a student raises a classroom challenge, as Peg has done, we would expect efforts, whether by NP, other students, or Peg, herself, to extinguish, if not resolve, the incipient conflict as expediently as possible. If satisfaction of the raised concern can somehow be hastily reached, that’s a bonus—what all parties want, at varying levels, is for the classroom conflict simply to end.

In our case, we see this preference in motion when usually-silent Vijay, NP’s assistant, jumps into the fray with his hasty gesture of support in line 9: “Podcasts are coming up, right?” NP, in a mode of cooperation with Vijay toward

extinguishing the conflict, uses his question as a basis for minimizing Peg's concern:

"Yeah. We're actually gonna do a podcast-." By addressing Vijay, not Peg, NP indirectly moves to divert the conflict—to Manke, she is enacting an on-the-spot "politeness formula" that will smoothly restore order, nipping this mess in the bud. This particular bud, however, will not be nipped; rather, it is about to blossom, if in stages.

What allows for this breach of the expected to begin and, more importantly, progress? For one thing, recall that this event is transpiring in a very special type of classroom setting. Yes, the situation meets the universal, two-way definitional criteria I have earlier asserted for "classroom": at the front there stands someone of authority, presuming to know and to lead (that is, there is a person playing the role of *teacher*) and around the room are arrayed people who are there presumably to learn something they do not already know (there are persons playing the role of *student*). That is, the scene is clearly understood (if tacitly) as a group setting intended for the performance of *teaching and learning*. But, as has been explained in depth earlier, this classroom is one of a very special nature, as regards the prospects for demonstrations of difference, since the students, the faculty members in particular, hold institutional rank as high, or higher, than that of the teacher. Peg confirms this oddity of situation, herself, in lines 190-195 (in Appendix D) of her interview: Um, I guess it's been unusual in that it kind of functions like a class -- with class time in a classroom. We kind of have a teacher, who's Nora and maybe Martin, but really it's Nora and um thank God we're not getting grades, and then, uh, in an odd way, the students are professors.

In the typical classroom, where the reverse is true, we will scarcely see this conflictual exchange endure for more than a turn of speech or two, because, as argued above, all parties wish the conflict (which seldom surfaces, as it is) to end as expediently as possible. Furthermore, the student typically has reasonable concerns (as Peg suggests) that his or her grade may be jeopardized by furthering the outburst, especially if the student is of the age and maturity to understand such dynamics, say high-school aged or older. Indeed, in the present case, there is no grade at risk; furthermore, the protesting student outranks the teacher. Therefore, this special setting affords a special opportunity to observe not just the *initiation* of a short-lived dispute, as may be found elsewhere in the literature, rather, but we can further see and study the fuller play-out of a educational event that portrays the *engagement* of difference: the blossoming, not the nipping, of the bud.

If, indeed, “podcasts” were Peg’s chief concern, we might expect to see—after Vijay and NP had stated that the podcasts she’d just specified are indeed coming up— a response from her such as, simply. “Oh, good.” This helps to show that Peg’s specifying of podcasts serves mainly as a politeness move to soften this airing of much broader concerns (concerns spanning the wide range, in line 8, of “this, that and the other”). Peg, instead of saying “Oh, good” or the like, presses things directly toward the “brief discussion” she insists upon having, in fact, interrupting Nora to do so. She thusly provides rich discursive evidence of discomfort, yet also of her steadfastness, the two motivations in tension at this moment, recalling the Buberian ideals for dialogue of standing one’s ground while yet opening to other (Arnett, 2004). Importantly, for the sake of maintaining dialogue, she wants to, and does, maintain politeness, in the Brown and

Levinson (1987) sense, but she also wants this situation remedied, in the Peg and Dom sense!

Further scrutinizing Peg's move, we notice more than just vocal hesitations and speech repairs: "Anyway, I'm just- can- can we have a brief discussion?" In a sense, the choppiness clearly bespeaks discomfort, but let us more closely examine the utterance. First, we note that this interruption of NP begins with "Anyway," which, while cutting off NP's response to Vijay's question, yet serves as a politeness token, by acknowledging that she heard that. But it also indicates a suspension of that acknowledgement, as in, "however. . . there is more to the point I am making." Following her interrupting wedge, "Anyway," Peg reveals her politeness-assertiveness tension, continuing with a self-aborted "I'm just-" which appears very likely the beginning of "I'm just saying," a discourse marker thoroughly glossed by Craig and Sanusi (2000), who demonstrate that the expression serves four important functions in argument; one is that of face preservation for the adversary, and another is that of a marker of continuity—of integrity—in the speaker's own argument. Peg's "I'm just—"—even if not originally meant to be followed by the word "saying," as I am here speculating (I admit that we cannot know this with certainty)—serves, in any case, as a gesture of respect for NP's point, since "just" works to minimize the impact of the point about to be made, in effect translating to "I'm wanting to point out *just* [only] this little point."

Peg has some tricky power dynamics to tiptoe through, as she lowers the boom at this pivotal moment, the turning point of the whole project. And so it does not surprise us that Peg interrupts her own gesture, repairing it to a question, stammered a bit, at that:

“I’m just- can- can we have a brief discussion?” And we see further work done to minimize the potential face-threat, as Peg qualifies that her concerns involve only “this *part of things*.”

NP’s staccato and rhythmically spaced continuers “Yeah- yeah- yeah” serve to open space for additional protest—or at least critique—from Peg. This ongoing, if monosyllabic, invitation, following NP’s prior effort to assure Peg that podcasts were indeed going to be covered in class, may have played a role in allowing Peg to continue, even if the continuers were not uttered, by NP, for this purpose, but as automatic responses, made by a startled group leader who has generally shown, toward the faculty-“students” especially, a general orientation of openness.

I consider this an important, if unverifiable, possibility, given that we are seeing in this excerpt the very prominence of discomfort in the voicing of concerns during this student-teacher exchange. It is tough for Peg to register her complaint, but NP is helping her to do it. If, *dialogue in teaching and learning* requires some measure of “the *engagement* (not just the airing) *of difference*,” and, if conflict in the classroom (or other educational setting) is indeed dispreferred, then it may be helpful, possibly essential, that the teacher should respond with immediate tokens of encouragement that foster continued voicing of these student concerns, as NP has done, wittingly or not, in this case. NP’s interjected “Yeah- yeah- , yeah- , ” as Peg raised the ante, even if more automatic than strategic, aids Peg in her move to perform the dispreferred act of registering her frustration, a frustration she withheld, recall, for the entire two-hour session, until NP had moved to close the meeting.

For Peg, it is “now or never,” and NP, thus far, is opening to the conflict in the

now. Imagine, by way of contrast, if Peg's difficult initiation had been hastily met by NP with something like "I see this is important to you, Peg. Why don't we meet and talk this over in my office?" Such a move would seem to portray, for Peg and the group to appreciate, a laudable and calming openness, but also, and more certainly, it would serve to move the discussion safely out of the group setting, for efficacy in quelling the authority-threatening uprising. NP did not make that move or any other conventional move of stability, of damage control; whether uttered in shock or in strategy, her rhythmic continuers, "Yeah- yeah- yeah-," inched open the door for continued commentary from Peg.

In Peg's conflict-opening comments and in NP's interjected continuers, we see both the difficulty—and the promise—of initiating, in the classroom, the engagement of difference. Let us examine what immediately follows, in the transcript, as NP now gathers herself to respond to Peg, verbalizing a more thorough, if noticeably disjointed, response, as shown below, in this first segment of her speaking turn, from lines 12-30 in Appendix D Training Excerpt 4 (for context and continuity, Peg's request is again shown in the excerpted segment below):



Screenshot 5-3: NP moves in closer to the group, as Peg furthers her critique of what has been going on in the workshop. It has quickly become a tense moment; all are now closely attending to what Peg is saying.

- 14 Peg Anyway, I'm just- can- can we have a brief
 15 discussion [NP: Yeah- yeah- yeah-] about
 16 this *part* of things?
- 17 NP And so why don't you- on the discussion
 18 (pause) um, *add* some discussion about what
 19 you'd like to see done, and then Martin and
 20 Cleve and Stan, 'n we can- we've *got* time
 21 to- I mean, we've *built* time into that. In
 22 April- you know we've got different people
 23 coming in. So, to go back to I think Dom's
 24 question in the discussion group is why are
 25 we doing all this educationese ((she laughs;
 26 some other voices are heard)) in- instead of
 27 the technology, and I think- I can't
 28 remember if I answered or if I just thought
 29 about it, but anyway, what we're *trying* to
 30 do with this course redesign project is not
 31 just *plug in* a technology into whatever
 32 you're doing. . .

As analysts, we cannot help but notice, as we observe this budding classroom conflict taking shape, that we benefit greatly from the authenticity of the discursive data

at hand. We are not witnessing an *exercise* in classroom argumentation, such as the type studied by Craig and Sanusi (2000), wherein students studying argumentation are doing their best to conduct an in-class argument, as required in the day's lesson. Nor are we considering discourse of the type that an author, perhaps an expert in "educationese" (a pivotal term that first appeared in a comment written by Dom, posted in the course-required, though poorly attended, online discussion two days prior to this Week-5 event), might script, for exemplification, in a textbook or article on the subject of classroom conflict. In this case, the impending conflict is very real to the participants.

Therefore, in NP's response, to Peg's request for further discussion on this matter, we observe that NP performs her potentially "dialogic" response not in a clean, smooth manner, but in the messy, spontaneous, and yet direct way that bespeaks discursive authenticity. If not *grace* under pressure, it is at least *real*, under pressure, as NP attempts to maintain positive face while substantiating the importance of the very "educationese" now under attack.

First, NP re-enacts Peg's own discursive move in initiating her response, both speakers borrowing key words (in this case, the word "discussion") from the previous speaker's utterance, a gesture, intentional or not, of acknowledgement or, at least, of continuity: Peg has asked "Can we have a brief discussion"; NP answers (lines 17-19), "And so why don't you- on the discussion ((pause)) um, *add* some discussion about what you'd like to see done."

The "discussion" NP is talking about is the weekly online chat, which all participants are supposed to engage in at lunchtime on Mondays. As revealed in later comments made to Vijay, once the room cleared, NP is, while making this response,

annoyed that Peg would register her concerns here in the open room, when she did not post them (nor even attend) Monday's "discussion," where feedback had been specifically requested—and Dom had complied, admitting to his growing disinterest in "educationese." In fact, these weekly online discussions (which I regularly monitored and participated in) were *not* attended by the full group of the 10 or 12 participants who would attend the Wednesday face-to-face meetings. More likely, just 3 or 4 online participants would be present at the same time, with the "discussion" often centered upon, "Where is everybody? What are we supposed to be doing?"

"You want a 'discussion'?" NP implies, in so many words, in response to Peg, "then go 'add some discussion'" (her actual words)—where we'd *asked for it*—on the Monday discussion board." This initial reaction preserves NP's own positive face (that one's wishes be seen by others as reasonable or even desirable), since it demonstrates that Peg's (and everyone's) various concerns (let's assume valid) have been courted at all along. In this way, NP implies, through her response, that Peg's protest is neither unwelcomed, disruptive, nor especially provocative; it is merely somewhat tardy.

If there's a problem here, as Peg is surely suggesting, the problem does not lie in the program's make-up, but with Peg's spotty participation *within* the program's make-up. NP, in her immediate response, has recouped positive face, an important need, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), of any "competent adult." NP is that, and much more. Notably, she has built a reputation across this campus as a strong and confident leader and speaker. She is hardly inclined to wilt under Peg's (or anyone's) protest; in fact, it would be surprising to the group to see her "back down" at all, and she has not disappointed.

Now that Peg's own culpability has been pointed out (yet through a face-sensitive invitation to Peg, that she indeed should register her concerns—online. . . where they belong!), NP continues her response by rattling off the names of the three technical advisors in the group, demonstrating that she has amassed plenty of technological horsepower in this group. The things that Peg seems to find lacking have already been put into the plan or at least put into the time budget, all along (lines 19-21): “. . . and then Martin and Cleve and Stan, 'n we can- we've *got* time to- I mean, we've *built* time into that.” NP's multiple usage of the plural *we* also shows a general move toward unification of the group, which now risks fragmentation, possibly into those who support this protest and those who don't: one way or another, NP implies through this pronoun, “we” are all in this together.

And it is not NP herself, but a collective “we” that has (as implied) constructed the criticized training agenda: “we can- . . . we've *built* time into that.” NP is not going to stand alone in the face of this incipient protest, nor is she backing down in the face of face threat. Rather, she is moving forward into the fray, while working to create unity, instead of allowing this event to fragment the class, through the second of her three quickly uttered “we”s: “-we've *got* time to.” The first and third “we” have the program designers for their referent; it is the middle “we” she invokes that refers to the whole class, including the students, which includes the challenger, Peg.” It is as if she is saying, “Settle down, Peg, *we* will all pull together and be okay, and your concerns will be listened to, especially if you do what you are supposed to do, such as inputting your ideas into the online discussion.” In the face of what would likely be seen as a personal attack on NP, she has responded by hastily

dispersing the force of the attack, spreading it out over the whole group. This may serve to calm the affect, the angst, behind Peg's protest; let us move on in the transcript and see.

Continuing her response, NP next enlist Dom's (better placed) comments as concrete evidence that she is well aware of the issue Peg is now raising—inappropriately, here at the last minute, while the group is being dismissed. She is uncertain (she says) whether she actually responded to Dom, but she did at least *consider* his correctly-placed commentary (lines 27-29): “. . . and I think- I can't remember if I answered or if I just thought about it, but anyway, what we're *trying* to do. . . .” Here she is yet insisting that the problem is one of misunderstanding on the part of Peg, Dom, and anyone else who is unhappy with the course content. “Educationese,” she asserts, however boring the topic may seem, is crucial to course redesign (which is main thrust of this training project), even as it employs technology, which seems a more popular topic.

Having invoked Dom's commentary, registered at the right time and in the right place, she shows that she has duly considered the issue and has thought up a response, whether or not she has remembered to state it (lines 27-32): “and I think- I can't remember if I answered or if I just thought about it, but anyway, what we're *trying* to do with this course redesign project is not just *plug in* a technology into whatever you're doing. . . .” Technology is the sexy stuff, but it does not just “plug in” anywhere and thusly improve a course. To improve course requires understanding learning theory: hence the educationese that has been emphasized thus far

and, from the sound of NP's answer, will continue to be emphasized in this training, even if technology issues can also be beefed up some: "we can- we've *got* time to- I mean, we've *built* time into that." Nora has now acknowledged the dicey concerns of Peg, through a response made easier by its diversion, first toward Vijay, then toward Dom. She has shown openness and concern, yet she has, to this point, also stood her ground: without education theory, how would we know how to *apply* the technology we might learn to use?



Screenshot 5-4: As NP begins a hasty response, Ike laughs loudly and rises. He smiles and nods in Peg's direction, making a brief, unintelligible utterance, seemingly an affirmation to Peg, and he then takes a couple steps toward the door.

In the transcript, Nora's response is interrupted by the parenthetical (nonspeech) observation that Ike has begun to pack up his things, somewhat conspicuously. To him, the session is over. Peg had an issue; Nora is addressing it adequately, and Ike has places to be: it is almost 11:00; the session is supposed to be ending right now. And this matter, indeed, is not his issue, anyway (as was shown earlier, he does not find Kolb irrelevant,

just untested). His departure is not unlike the everyday university observation—perhaps a frustrating observation for lecturing faculty members—that student sometimes pack their things when the clock indicates that class is over or is within a minute or two of the ending time. In large lectures, especially, this is an everyday occurrence; there, a sense of anonymity allows the students to act on their wishes. But in the smaller class, this is not such a typical occurrence. Ike is evidently uncomfortable, and he wants out of the scene.

This act of Ike's (softened as it is, by his perfunctory nodding in apparent affirmation to NP, as she answers Peg, evidently acceptably to Ike, such that the class really is now "over") once again solidifies an assertion I am making about this particular "classroom" as research site toward ultimately understanding "classroom dialogue": we will see things in this special setting—where some "students" are tenured professors outranking the teachers—that we will not find enacted in the typical classroom, even though the *desires* are no doubt present in the typical classroom, as evidenced by the contrasting student behavior enabled by the relative anonymity of the lecture hall.

But Ike's move does more than reaffirm the special nature of my site. I would assert that his move toward departure provides us with nonverbal support for my main assertion of this analysis. What we are seeing here, a direct and quite rational challenge to the teacher's authority, is not an easy move at all, even for the full and tenured faculty members, who outrank everyone else in the room, by institutional standards. If it is difficult for Peg (as seen by the late timing of her utterance and its hesitant flow), then it must be next to impossible for typical students in typical classes. Nor is this easy on Ike, nor on NP, the teacher/leader, but she deals with it in a way that is both subtle (she only implies that Peg is off-base by making her reply her, and not online) and also

authoritative, such that—for the moment, anyway—she is able to quickly squelch the protest.

In actual utterance, NP's response to Peg continues—without any significant pause—during Ike's noisy and conspicuous packing up. Continuing to preserve face, while also standing her ground, she labels the project an “experiment,” one nonetheless aimed at helping the faculty to understand that good use of technology requires some selection (some “picking”), and to do that requires understanding learning theory. Ike continues to pack up and also continues to make supportive gestures toward NP (or is he just portraying easy signs of politeness to counterbalance his impolite action?), as NP returns some of Peg's criticism in a still-muted and face-aware, manner, as we shall next examine.:

33 NP . . . But we're trying to actually- and this is- and this is an experiment- that
34 we're doing. Um, is we're trying to take some of the educational stuff that
35 we've worked on and SEE if we can help people do a BETTER job of
36 redesigning their courses. And then [Ike: Sure ((as he utters this, he is
37 unplugging his laptop from the wall outlet))] picking technologies that are
38 actually, you know, help you think about 'well what am I really
39 after?' And then pick technologies that really get at, you know, what are
40 you really after kind of stuff, and uh-

In NP's stammered continuation—“we're trying to actually- and this is- and this is an experiment- that we're doing. Um, is we're trying to”—we see clear signs of NP's discomfort, but we see also her steadfastness, as she answers Peg's challenge, which, NP will soon discover, has only just begun. The emphasis NP places, in the next sentence, on both “see” and “better,” once again support my analytical claim that in the face of in-class criticism, the teacher's

need for face preservation is mediated by a parallel need to maintain authority. The first of the two emphasized words, *see*, in “and SEE if we can help people,” serves to reframe Peg’s criticism as quite possibly Peg’s own shortcoming. That is, in this “experiment” we want to “see” if faculty *can* actually be trained, as is hoped. She implies that Peg’s antics are raising some doubt as to whether this is possible. In my meetings with NP, she raised these doubts directly a number of times. Faculty presume that they know how to teach, though (and of course, many do so expertly, whether trained, naturally inclined, or just taught by experience and reflection). Yet in the same sentence we see NP’s mollifying use of the stressed “better,” as in “help people do a BETTER job of,” which implies that a basic competence is already presumed, a direct exemplification of the preservation of Peg’s positive face (appearing competent).

The End of the Session Five Becomes the Beginning of Situational Transformation

To this point in this chapter, I have worked to present a detailed analysis of the key participants’ (the erstwhile *students*’) motivations for attending this training program, since these motivations are vital to defining “the situation,” as it bears upon the discourse within it. In the analysis of these motivations, as evidenced both in interview data and session data, I have argued for a very significant and “pervasive” dilemma embedded in the arena of faculty training: that the trainees must balance their desires to seem collegial and supportive learners against needs for asserting their pre-training competence as teachers (although trained extensively as scholars, but not necessarily as teachers). I have further presented abundant discursive data and analysis to show that one force that can mitigate the dilemma is a training focus that foregrounds *technology*, since it is very reasonable that faculty would gain from such an update, and there would then be less

need for defensiveness or other constraints on the prospective dialogue.

My point is that a technological focus will relieve needs for posturing and critique (among the faculty/learners), which will enhance the authenticity of the discourse within the situation, or at any rate, add to the participants' sense that the event is worthwhile. This situational dynamic, and its effects upon the in-session training discourse, I argue, is important to the dialogic discourse analysis I intend to perform in the next chapter, as a vehicle for testing and applying the Pragmatics of Dialogue model I developed in collaboration with Robert Craig (Craig & Zizzi, 2007; Zizzi, 2008a, 2008b).

The moments that follow what has unexpectedly transpired above, namely Peg's initiation of her protest, continue in an even-more unexpected fashion, leading to what I believe is an excellent example of what Cissna and Anderson (e.g., 1998, 2004) have termed a "dialogic moment" or a "moment of meeting," both terms owing to their work's grounding in Martin Buber's views of dialogue as a rare event. This forthcoming "moment of meeting" between Peg and Nora sparked, indeed, a wholesale remaking of the situation, both in terms of course content (the course curriculum was hurriedly overhauled, prior to the next session, even) and, in parallel, in terms of the participants' motivations and feelings of satisfaction, especially for Dom and Peg. This momentous two-part protest—pre-adjournment, which is in progress in the transcripts presented to this point, and post-adjournment—unfolds as follows. Following the transcripts and screen shots, I will conclude the chapter with my summarizing analysis of this event and of the chapter as a whole.



Screenshot 5-5: As Ike is moving to exit the room, NP asks him to stay put (recalling Mary Manke's, 1997, example of the "polite" command/request, "Sally would you like to sit down?") Meanwhile Martin begins to quietly speak toward Peg, who has stood and is packing up. She continues to gather up things but also looks up to hear him, since he seems to be addressing her, not the whole group.

- 41 NP Now one of- okay- speak- speaking of
 42 technology, Guys- uh, Ike, could you s- s-
 43 just stop a second? One of the technologies
 44 we're introducing you to is *blogging*. Yeah
 45 And so you're going to get- y-
- 46 Dom (softly) That's fine.
- 47 NP You're going to have to set up your own
 48 *blog*. And then I set up a *course blog*. And
 49 I'm going (Ike interrupts unintelligibly
 50 toward Vijay) to invite you to the *course*
 51 *blog*. But until you set up your own- and
 52 we've got the directions and we'll e-mail
 53 these to you (Vijay softly interjects, to
 54 Ike, that the web tool is "Blogger")- until
 55 you set up your own *blog* we can't invite you
 56 to *course blog*.
- 57 Peg Okay, so- just so-
- 58 NP We're trying to use some of these
 59 technologies [Peg: as an example-] to help
 60 you *learn* to use them.

We see, above, that Nora is trying to assure Peg that the training will feature plenty of technology—citing blogging as an example and stressing that she is interested in Peg’s “*learning*.” But this neither placates Peg, nor does it give her a confident sense that she will learn to blog, without more hands-on learning, which there has been little of so far. Peg does not seem to appreciate the references to what might have been learned on the Monday chat sessions, which she does not regularly attend.

- 61 Peg Okay. So on that point, would it be possible
 62 to do a *Wednesday* class where we’re all here
 63 on computers setting up blogs. And then when
 64 I got a question *Stan’s* right there or
 65 you’re right there- or- you know what I
 66 mean? So that-
- 67 NP Well, it’s basically just e-mail. Uh- you
 68 don’t really have to set it up. [Peg: Okay-
 69 all right] It’s just e-mail.
- 70 Peg All right (she rises to leave)



Screenshot 5-6: Peg is now standing next to and speaking softly to the still-seated Stan, who works as the designated “technology assistant” for faculty in Peg’s program.

- 71 NP And so we’re trying-

72 Ike But sometimes just seeing it is- to do it in
 73 the environment where it is. Sometimes that
 74 first *seeing* it- saying it's just this or
 75 just that [NP: Yeah] Yeah, it's *true*, but
 76 there's a big activation energy between
 77 "it's just this" and doing it-

78 Martin Real quickly- you and Stan, feel free to be
 79 working (laughs) on technologies and- you
 80 know- and Cleve- (()) and-

Above (lines 72-77), Ike, who has stayed out of this fracas and had tried to be the first one out of the room, until halted by Nora, moves in to make comments to support where Peg is coming from. He does not need to battle the "educationese," but he clearly understands and values lab-like, hands-on learning. Martin, meanwhile, intimates to Stan, Peg's designated technical support, that he had better get ready to do some presenting on technical how-tos, a point Nora reinforces. But Peg will not be put off, and Buber, whose dialogue requires standing one's ground, would presumably approve.

81 NP And Stan *should* be working with you, Peg,
 82 about *thinking* about these things, too. So
 83 we've got a-

84 Peg No I- I understand-

85 Ike But it *can* make a big difference, even if
 86 it's *trivial*, to see it done.

87 NP To see it done. Okay.

88 Dom: The hands-on, in-class, yeah-

89 Ike Nothing is- there- there's nothing scarier
 90 than doing something you haven't done
 91 before, even if five seconds after you've
 92 started you're ((licensed to go)).

93

94 Ike, too, knows how to press a point that is not being picked up (by Nora), though

95 he buffers the face-threat of his reinforcement with (even if it's trivial),
 96 which addresses Nora's mildly dismissive comment (above in line 67) that blogging does
 97 not require hands-on learning, since "it's basically just e-mail." This
 98 time, with Ike's help and also support from Dom, Nora seems to get the point (line 87),
 99 and the exchange, and the class session, would seem to be done.

100 NP Okay. Have a good week. See you. (She steps
 101 over to a cell phone on a table and speaks
 102 into it to Julia, who is listening in,
 103 speakerphone-style, from home.) Hi Julia.
 104 You still there?

105 Julia (voice is coming from the cell phone) Yeah,
 106 I'm still here. Are we breaking for today?-

107 NP Yeah, we're done. How are you doing? Are you
 108 well?

109 Julia I'm okay. (()) I've got a cold, so I'm
 110 staying home and working here, so-

111 NP So are you gonna be here tomorrow, for the
 112 Eiger seminar?

113 Julia Yeah, I plan to.

NP Okay, Al'right. See you tomorrow. Cheers.
 [Julia: Bye] Bye. (NP turns off the phone.
 Meanwhile most of the group is packing up,
 some chatting in pairs, including Peg who is
 making comments to Stan, her high-tech
 helper, justifying her protest, which, we
 are about to see, is not yet finished.

114 Peg . . . And so I don't feel I need, like, the
 115 diversity stuff. I'm TOTally for diversity.
 116 I'm usually presenting- I'm usually the
 117 person presenting in the diversity
 118 workshops. So I don't want to spend two
 119 hours listening to JUDD talking about
 120 diVERsity!

121



Screenshot 5-7: As Peg finishes her bold statement to Stan, Nora has caught her eye from across the room. Peg is, in a sense, “busted” making her continued critical remarks. With an air of assertiveness, she continues her comment, though now raising her volume, gesturing, and redirecting her gaze to directly address Nora across the room.



Screenshot 5-8: Peg then starts walking around toward Nora, continuing to gesture and speak. She is ready for a deeper-level, face-to-face confrontation.

122 Peg I'm- what I'm- I'm just cONTINuing the same
 123 thing. And I don't mind- if YOU don't mind
 124 hearing it, I don't mind saying it.

The subtle dynamics of dialogue, as it unfolds pragmatically, is the substance of

the following chapter, not this one, which intends, mainly, to explore the situation (as an idea and for this particular case), as orienting space for discourse, dialogic or not. But I will point out that the continuation of Peg's Protest, as I've called this incident, appears predicated on Peg's not feeling fully heard, the first time, as analysis above revealed.

Here is a very significant finding of this larger dissertation, which I will come back to in the final chapter, Summary and Conclusions. Sometimes the mere *appearance* of dialogue works to satisfy the presumed obligations of the presumably "offending" party (Nora think she adequately answered Peg's concerns), and, in those cases, the "offended" party may well back off, because the offender said something that seems conciliatory, and that warrants some gesture of acknowledgement. In a sense the parties are tangled up in words. The problem seems to have been addressed, yet the offended party is still offended. What to say? Hard to know.

But the problem has not gone away, and the offended party (Peg) seems to know it, so she continues to voice her complaint, but not to Nora. However, if, as in this case, both parties are willing to address each other in the face-to-face manner that harks to the Buberian ideal of not backing down, while yet maintaining a sense of Levinas's ethic of Other-first, the continuation of the aborted dialogue becomes possible, if difficult. For this reason I call attention to the nonverbal elements that follow, especially gaze, as this dialogue reaches its *moment*.



Screenshot 5-9: Peg, continuing to speak, makes her way around to NP, whose attention and gaze, Peg's approach notwithstanding, are at this point fixed upon a sheet she is holding. She is neither retreating from the startling advance by Peg, nor exacerbating the tension by way of a direct, challenging gaze.



Screenshot 5-10: As Peg reaches Nora, both are standing, but neither is attempting to make direct eye contact with the other, yet.

Despite the lack of eye contact, yet, this meeting, in my view, already represents a consummate example of dialogue, *face to face*, in the Levinasian concept of the face of other, of a radical alterity that must be faced—in a sense faced destructively—as the two women are, if without eye-contact, yet, doing very directly. This is Cissna and

Anderson's (1998) dialogic *moment*. This is MacCaw's (2008) teachable *moment*. Even more so, this is Buber's (1958) I and Thou *meeting*. The physical facing will come next. Beyond the discursive, the verbal, registering of concerns in Peg's not-completely-apprehended protestation minutes before, the *meeting* is now undeniable; Buber's narrow ridge is here met upon, and the dialogic *situation*—the prospective garden for dialogue—can, for better or worse, never be the same, hereafter. Yes, what *was* has been, in Levinasian sensitivities, destroyed in the *struggle*; the question becomes, then, what *will be*, in Buberian sensitivities, reconstructed in its place, via the *meeting*. With the help from detailed captioning, I present the following selected images and discourse, to reveal the answer. (Note, for closer analytic scrutiny, in terms of pragmatics, this same exchange (minus screen shots) will be examined in Chapter 6 as a preliminary exemplar of the revised Pragmatics of Dialogue approach at the interactional, within situational, level of analysis.)



Screenshot 5-11: More or less in unison, in a dialogue of reciprocal nonverbal cooperation, both women slip into their seats, direct gaze still averted.



Screenshot 5-12: Once seated, both turn and now immediately face each other. My small digital voice recorder, seen on the table in the foreground, is still recording, as is, obviously, my videocamera. While continuing to speak, Peg maintains a polite smile and makes abundant and animated gestures, some seemingly shielding herself from Nora's intense stare. Nora remains almost motionless, head tipped forward, eyes locked onto Peg, as this impromptu tête-à-tête further heats up, nonverbally and verbally.

- | | | |
|-----|-----|------------------------------------------------------|
| 125 | Peg | So- just as a- <i>nother</i> example, you've got- so |
| 126 | | you have to now take this in the context of |
| 127 | | I'm a STUdent- I'm coming- (pause) |
| 128 | NP | Yeah- |



Screenshot 5-13: Peg breaks eye contact, pauses, and looks far off in the distance, as for effect, seemingly reluctant to finish her sentence. Her pause is accentuated by a prominent sigh and a protracted

opening of her mouth. Nora's gaze remains unbroken.

129 Peg So, I want the two hours to be used
130 primarily for me to get info- exposure to
131 *hands-on* with technology. But instead, I've
132 got Judd coming to talk about diversity. I-
133 understand totally- okay-



Screenshot 5-14: With some exaggerated head tilting and gazing up or off to the side, Peg starts nodding, peers over her eyeglasses at Nora, and resumes speaking.

134 Peg O-kay- okay- but- that is something I
135 probably *do* know about myself. A lot.(())
136 So, anyway- but the stuff that I *don't* know
137 about is the *newer* technology. So I know how
138 to show a film. I really do know how to show
139 a film. Uh, and you know put a VHS in, or a
140 DVD- so- but-



Screenshot 5-15: Mid-sentence, Peg takes a breath

and leans back demonstrably, as if to indicate an easing of the tension. NP, her program, in a sense, under attack, maintains her nearly motionless posture.



Screenshot 5-16: As Peg resumes speaking, she sometimes looks away, while NP's gaze remains riveted upon her.

- | | | |
|-----|-----|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 141 | Peg | And-and again, kind of thinking in terms of |
| 142 | | this <i>distance</i> technology [NP: Yeah], <i>that</i> is |
| 143 | | gonna be like <i>whoa</i> , what happens with this? |
| 144 | NP | (nodding): Yeah. |
| 145 | Peg | So <i>that's</i> all I- |
| 146 | NP | Yeah- no- I hear you- |
| 147 | Peg | I just wanted to- you know- |
| 148 | NP | (nodding) Okay- |
| 149 | Peg | Okay. |



Screenshot 5-17: After Peg utters her “Okay,” she looks away, with raised eyebrows and makes a face, as in relief. The meeting was difficult, but now she knows that Nora heard her, just as she had *heard* Nora’s powerful and unabating gaze. She rises quickly to depart the tense scene.



Screenshot 5-18: As Peg turns to walk away, Nora again begins to speak. Peg looks back at Nora and smiles, as in both relief and gratitude.

From a verbal standpoint, the sparse discourse interwoven among the visual evidence above does not say a lot. The discourse is markedly disjointed (see, for prime example, lines 141-146, which feature multiple restarts but no thought finished); the verbal script therefore serving better to indicate the thorny interactional difficulty

underway—the reason for the sheer rarity of such meetings as this—than it serves to bring any conversational clarity to the tense scene.

Further analytic points could, as always, be drawn out (as will be demonstrated in the following chapter, with its interactional, within situational, focus), but I assert that the talk, itself, is secondary, at this point, save for the one, most-critical, utterance within the whole of this unexpected, face-to-face exchange: Nora's affirmation, in line 146:

“Yeah- no- I hear you-”—translated, Yeah- (I understand), no- (don't get me wrong, since, now) I (cannot help but to) hear you-. Indeed Nora did hear Peg this time, if not so completely in the first exchange, minutes before, and the entire training event thusly pivots, that is, turns, here and now (and then with hurried follow-up, as Nora and Martin went straight into the planning of a course overhaul anchored in technology). Indeed, the next meeting (Week 6), as will be analyzed in Chapter 6, did *not*, as above announced at the session's end (and this announcement, detonating the situation's dialogic flashpoint), feature “Judd coming to talk about *diVERsity*”—so, evidenced in this way, the situation, itself, became destroyed, yet then reconstructed, that is, in a word, transformed. Hence this moment opened—*through* dialogue—a much more fertile space *for* dialogue. This we will next see in a different light, such that even a lowest-ranking member at the event, a graduate student assistant, might find a space to contribute, dialogically, that is, with a sense among others, of mutuality, of equilibrium, as will take place in Chapter 6, if not *before* this Week-5 turning point, then most surely *after* it.

In sum, I have attempted to show in this chapter that, in the present situation—in the main, one of faculty development training—participant motivations for attending are

important, though they vary among the principal players, and also inherently dilemmatic. This training event, as billed, promised technology as a main focus, yet this promise lay unfulfilled for the first five weeks, as major emphasis was placed, instead, upon “educationese.” That unfulfilled promise (rich potential that it held, against the pervasive dilemma inherent to the situation) came to a flashpoint, as seen in and around Peg’s protest, all the more illuminating of this pervasive dilemma: On one hand, university faculty, especially veteran professors, know that, when engaged in the practice of collegial faculty development, they should maintain a learning posture, and this implies admitting to a significant “not-yet-knowing” (hence to portray an appropriate readiness to learn); yet, in this collegial environment among esteemed peers, they need to maintain positive face, this hinging upon a presumption of pedagogical competence: “I already know this; teach me something *new*.”

This proposed dilemma, rendered above in technicolor—thanks to the courage of Peg, relational history with Nora notwithstanding, to speak up, and the willingness of Nora, flashpoint fireworks notwithstanding, to listen—points to a compelling implication for improved practice in the conducting of faculty training, toward both dialogue (my proposed ideal for meaningful teaching-learning) and toward program effectiveness (the categorical ideal of any faculty training program). The implication is that the faculty training focus must regard something truly new, and thereby not formerly knowable, such as, perhaps, a change in program curriculum or, in this case, the prospective deployment of newer technology

Analytic Summary of the Dialogic *Situation* at Hand

Indeed, “faculty training” involves a topical focus and implied set of skills that, presumably, faculty already hold—and of course, many do hold. Brilliant instruction takes place at every university, with or without strong programs of faculty training; such is the result of a felicitous combination of aptitude, experience, and motivation, where present, provided that there is also a courageous willingness to take risks, indeed, even a willingness to fail (Palmer, 1998)—and from the failure, to learn and grow. Whether or not brilliant instruction is the exception—or the rule—will, of course, vary by institution, and it is the administrative goal of making superb instruction the rule, not the exception, that gives life, and funding, to robust programs of faculty development such as exists at this research site.

But laudable goals and adequate funding do not, by themselves, guarantee that faculty training programs will achieve their objectives. To present a plethora of pedagogical principles to “trainees” (especially tenured faculty) already presumed expert in their practice, risks, I argue, and hope to have shown in this study, contributing, at the situation level, to systematic distortion of communication (cf., Deetz, 1992) that squelches mutuality, authenticity, and openness, sometimes even the fourth of Buber’s dialogic mandates, presentness. To wit, I have, in my included photo essays, spared the reader any screenshots, and many are available, showing laptops “zoomed in” upon with my videocamera, laptops revealing work being done that had absolutely nothing to do with the training underway. In this regard, maybe the “students” (faculty) in this study are more typical as college students than one might have first expected, though I will note than never did my lens chance upon a laptop excursion over to Facebook. And those elements—mutuality, authenticity, openness, and presentness—according to Martin

Buber (1955, 1958) and his legion of devotees (e.g. Arnett, 2004; Cissna & Anderson, 1998; McCaw, 2008; Pearce & Pearce, 2000) are, indeed, posited as the essential requirements of dialogue.

Further complicating this training *situation* is the ever-present undercurrent that, as pedagogical best practices are laid out in the training, faculty know that professional and institutional constraints, such as ever-growing class sizes and pressing scholarly expectations, strain the prospects of being able to put into action the pedagogical principles and practices presented. Here we see yet another pervasive dilemma, implicit throughout this chapter and well characterized by Peg, when she says (in Appendix D, Training Session Excerpt 3, lines 110-114) “Now *that* was *great*- I found that very interesting. But I also left thinking it would take *weeks* to design a test like that. How- y’know- is *that*- am I really gonna *do* something like that?”

Of course, it is both natural and understandable that, in developing a workshop toward pedagogical improvement, experts in pedagogy would wish to promote pedagogical theories and practices, for example, those inherent in learning models such as the Kolb model of learning types and related cyclical processes. The implication, then, is this: in order to ease the pervasive dilemma that constrains the discourse in teaching-learning (so to enhance, say, the productive sharing of faculty experience)—especially when this training discourse is sought at the idealized level of *dialogue*, where skin must thicken so that difference (including differences in skill level and understanding) may engage—the training should orient to subject matter that is both *safe* to not already have

known and *useful* against the increasing challenges felt, generally, by the training participants, for example, challenges of growing class size, thinning departmental resources, and increasing scholarly expectation. When the training focus becomes “new technology,” the dilemma is prospectively managed on both fronts: face needs and practical utility. Meanwhile, while the new technology is rolled out, an exemplifying theme can be embedded in the technological undercurrent—built into the lesson as a “for-example,” and this theme might be anything the trainer would promote, including, for example, diversity themes and even “the Kolb model.”

Yet we can scarcely miss, from the above event and its situational analysis, a concomitant lesson in the dialogic situation. Along with the case-specific benefit of coaching faculty training in the presentation of “new” technologies or material comes a broader lesson. When the participants in teaching and learning dare to engage, face-to-face, for Levinas’s destruction of relational status quo, they find themselves at a place of Buberian confirmation, and even of Rogers’ unconditional positive regard. They have blown up the barrier, met upon the ridge, and are thusly situationally ready to rebuild, together, in rich mutuality, the situation in which dialogue is both the spark and the fuel, for rebuilding, for teaching, for learning.

CHAPTER 6:

DATA ANALYSIS, PART II: DIALOGUE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING—
ANATOMY OF A PROCESS: THREE STAGES AT THREE TEMPERATURESDemonstrating Dialogic Discourse Analysis, through the *Pragmatics of Dialogue*

Within any human *situation*—compelling, overarching, and influential as may be this situation—“interaction happens.” The goal of this chapter is to aid understanding and, thereby, practice, regarding a prospectively dialogic discourse in the situation of faculty development, within the larger arena of teaching and learning. As this chapter unfolds, I will closely examine selected segments of transcribed discussion from the training sessions, augmented by the secondary data of my interviews, to closely examine and refine the existing stages that comprise the pragmatics of dialogue model introduced in Chapter 4. As I will explain below, the model, as first published (Craig & Zizzi 2007) and later refined (Zizzi, 2008a, 2008b) now includes these three stages:

- (1) Moves that work to *create discursive openings*, that make space for the engagement of difference
- (2) Moves that work to *sustain discursive engagement*, that keep difference alive
- (3) Moves that work to *generate and reveal discursive productivity*, as seen in
 - (a) conceptual innovation/movement (emergence of new ideas)
 - (b) relational development (a sense of solidarity arises)
 - (c) practical plans and implications (follow-up actions are determined)

Let us, before moving into this chapter's substance—a set of deeper exemplifications and multi-level looks at the three stages, as will be the substance of this chapter—take a definitional look at these three latest-named (in the model's continual development) stages in action, by using passages from Peg's Protest, to show the connection between situational analysis (of the last chapter) and the imbedded interaction, ripe, in its pragmatic way, for analysis, with the goal of better informing practice.

For Stage 1, “Moves that work to *create discursive openings*, that make space for the engagement of difference,” one would be tempted, looking at the second round of Peg's Protest (the face-to-face meeting) and point to the moment when Peg announces, after being caught complaining to her aide: “I’m- what I’m- I’m just conTINuing the same thing. And I don’t mind- if YOU don’t mind hearing it, I don’t mind saying it.”

I, however, would call that moment not Stage 1, but a heating-up-fast embodiment of Stage 2, “Moves that work to *sustain discursive engagement*, that keep difference alive.” As I will show as this chapter progresses, a significant shortcoming of the latest-existing model is its lack of sensitivity to varying levels—from nuanced to thunderous—of intensity within discursive performance through the stages, 1-3. So I hint, here, of what is to develop later in the chapter, as I reiterating that what Peg said, “I’m just conTINuing the same thing,” is indeed a continuation, but *not* a continuation (in this pragmatic sense) of the first part of the episode, which seemed to end acceptably but is not, as things are turning out, finished by any means. Peg, in her utterance, is, indeed, referring back to that just-passed go-round, but I mean to look more closely at

the action, in naming exemplars of stages and levels. In that closer scrutiny, I mean to show this chapter's added analytical value as revealing glimpses of the fine points within the stages, such that we might identify a more salient "return of serve," the one that truly sparked NP and Peg's dialogic *peak*. Notice that I use this word, *peak*, instead of dialogic *moment*, wanting now to show dynamic range, not just the "on or off" (and almost perpetually off, in terms of the dialogic moment, universally understood as a rarity). No, in my view, it is not Peg, but Nora, who instigates this dialogue, who creates, most compellingly, the discursive opening. And right here shines evidence of the rich value of video data, augmenting discourse analysis. I say Stage 1 occurred via Nora's fixed gaze from across the room, while Peg was complaining to her aide. See? It's a critical, but nonverbal, pragmatic move of dialogue, sure as the nose on Levinas's *face*! It may not serve as discourse, but it is surely powerfully discursive, in how it beckoned, from Peg, *a response—inviting, at that very moment, Peg's protest*. Now we see, in a radical alterity of its own, "Peg's protest" turned upside down, possibly to be renamed, NP's invitation for Peg to maintain the rally into something special: for Levinas to burn the mother down, and then for Buber, with forgiveness and a hug from Rogers, to rebuild it, better, from the ashes.

That opening point demonstrated, this chapter will now begin by reviewing the scholarly origins and intent of the pragmatics of dialogue model, which are present as a practical framework for doing dialogic discourse analysis. Following this review of the model's genesis and development, I present three fresh and detailed illustrative exemplifications of the model. My intent is to test (and develop) the Pragmatics model, in use, by closely examining key discursive interactions within the three marker in events I

have selected, across the lifespan of the training project I studied as participant-observer. Aided by ideas from politeness theory and other relevant concepts in discourse analysis, and enlightened by a recurring metaphor of tennis back-and-forth (if not competitive matches), I hope to reveal useful analytic insights as regards dialogue in teaching and learning. In particular I wish to enlighten each of the three contrasting discursive exemplars I have identified and selected for analysis, while also using these chosen passages for testing and illuminating the three-stage model, itself (the three stages with levels of their own, let's say cool, warm, and hot), for strengths and weaknesses, since I yet consider this interactional and dialogic mode of analysis exploratory.

The Need for—and Development of—the *Pragmatics of Dialogue* Model

This study's review of the literature has canvassed a number of related investigations and perspectives on interactive classroom discourse—ostensibly dialogic; there is no need to reiterate or even enumerate them all here, again. I would, however, along with nodding to Gumperz (1981) and Wilkinson (1981), remind the reader of the centrality, as additional influences among the literature, of Cazden's (1988) classic text, *Classroom Discourse*, Sarles's (1993) *Teaching as Dialogue*, Burbules's (1993) *Dialogue in Teaching: Theory and Practice*, Manke's (1997) *Classroom Power Relations*, Vella's (2008) *On Teaching and Learning*, and, above them all, perhaps, in terms of analytic depth, Elizabeth Ellsworth's (1997) *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address*. And let us not fail to acknowledge that it was in 1970, long before these authors' cited works, that Paolo Freire published *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, re-awakening, in modern times, the ancient ideal, Socratic in origin, of the centrality of *dialogue* in education. Especially, Robin Alexander's (2005, 2008) recent

work, cited in the opening of this study, purports to analyze the talk—to perform discourse analysis—of the classroom toward better understanding educational practices. Yet, with the exception of my own paper (Zizzi, 2008), presented at a regional conference, though withheld, pending this study’s developments, for tightening toward prospective publication, none of the extant literature purports to explicitly present or employ an analytic method that is, or even could be, explicitly labeled *dialogic discourse analysis*, with just one other exception.

Extensive keyword searching, not only in academic databases, but across the Web, using the search phrase “*dialogic discourse analysis*,” does produce one relevant occurrence of “dialogic discourse analysis,” by Martin Nystrand (2002). Nystrand’s dialogic discourse analysis, indeed, regards college-level instruction and learning. In fact, Nystrand—earlier cited with several co-authors (2003), as an investigator of classroom talk who analyzes classroom dialogue expressly in its triadic sense—proposes to have coined the term dialogic discourse analysis, which he uses in studies of writing instruction. Nystrand’s method is grounded in Bakhtinian sensitivities—thus, he is interested not just in writer-as-rhetor, but in writer-in-connection-to-reader. Through this frame of analysis he proceeds to study the effects, over time, of peer-review sessions among college freshmen upon their composition revisions, these revisions constituting the “dialogic” product. Simply stated, in his own terms, Nystrand (2002) explains, “This method examines the effects of talk about writing on processes of revision” (p. 381). This is the entire scope of Nystrand’s “dialogic discourse analysis,” as is clear in his essay’s final sentence: “Dialogic discourse analysis will always be a useful research tool to link

features and functions of text with the reciprocal processes of reading and writing in particular contexts” (p. 390).

It is one thing to study interactive processes by which the freshman composition evolves or even—closer to home—to study dialogue in the classroom, looking for pedagogical impacts and implications through the lens of *pedagogy*. It is quite another matter to study dialogue in teaching and learning, as practical *communication* theory applied to pedagogy—that is, to illuminate and inform a practice of doing dialogic communication in educational settings. Thusly, I would assert that the *Pragmatics* model developed while I worked in the earliest stages of analysis of the data I had gathered for this eventual dissertation, working under close guidance from, and original co-authorship with, Robert Craig (Craig & Zizzi, 2007) stands alone as a pragmatic heuristic for the consideration of unfolding of dialogue in practice. This model, thereby, undergirds the exploratory method I propose for an expressly *dialogic* discourse analysis, which, I propose, serves to inform a close examination of naturally occurring discourse toward revealing the moves of dialogue in practice. As foreshadowed above, I will, in this chapter, apply the Pragmatics model, in its three stages and in their three “temperatures,” toward contextual refinement in the arena of interest: formalized settings of teaching and learning. Before moving into that analysis, however, I will, for the sake of historicity, provide a brief overview of the model’s original development and presentation.

As first presented in “Toward a Normative Pragmatic Model of Dialogue” (Craig & Zizzi, 2007), the intention of this model was to “identify a specific pragmatic sequence that, we argue, both instantiates some key qualities attributed to dialogue by normative theories and also offers something new for normative theorists to ponder” (pp. 152-153).

As the data for analysis in this first offering (Craig & Zizzi, 2007) of the Pragmatics model, toward the goal just quoted, we analyzed the following exchange—taken from the same data set as was gathered for this dissertation (specifically, from the Week 3 training session)—toward a pragmatics of dialogue.

In this exchange, which I transcribed using Jeffersonian conventions for conversation analysis (appropriate for relatively small amounts of data treated to extensive analysis), Louise, a graduate student who is one of the presenters at this week's session, is engaged by the participants, as she presents some tips regarding the cultivating of productive discourse when teaching in the online format. In particular, she is warning against the natural tendency to become drawn into unproductive and exaggerated online conflict, sometimes known as “flaming.”

- 150 Louise u::m (1.3) and the last thing I want to say is
 151 that um avoiding flaming is not about avoiding
 152 conflict (1.1) uh, I've had conflict- because I'm
 153 controlling an' because I think I know everything
 154 better than the others I'm a typical student so
 155 we have conflict (0.8) but we had u:m y'know we
 156 didn't so [I-
- 157 Ike [but these are smaller classes too
 158 right?
- 159 Louise yes (.) twelve fifteen
- 160 Ike so I think that might suppress that 'cuz you sort
 161 of know who they are=
- 162 Louise =yes=
- 163 Ike =and it's easier ta:
- 164 NP but when you talk about conflict do you mean
 165 disagreement on arguments you know like (1.0)
 166 [Iraq (laughter)]
- 167 Dom
 168 [sub-stance (0.6) substance
- 169 NP or something or do you mean um (1.2) do you mean

170 like real conflict like shut up you idiot=
 171 Dom =they thought your point of view was idiotic
 172 Louise um real conflict but uh it remains um civil (.)
 173 you see?=
 174 Julia =intellectual conflict not emotional conflict
 175 Dom the- there's something about e-mail though that
 176 releases (2.0) th' id (1.7)
 177 NP the id? (from Craig & Zizzi, 2007, p. 154)

From this discursive exchange, we teased out the three basic pragmatic stages of dialogue: onset, sustenance, and productivity (in the form of “new-meaning” emerging). Our original model begins with Stage 1: “Significant difference perceived and demonstrated” (p. 155). For the carry-through of all three stages, we proposed a tennis metaphor, such that this first stage can be thought of as *not* “the serve” (else any utterance might qualify as the “onset of dialogue”), rather, the “return of serve.” That is, we proposed that dialogue begins when “B says to A, in effect, ‘I’m not so sure about that’” (p. 155). It is at that point, that the interlocutors (or dialogic analyst) can recognize, “Game on,” though the sense we intend is that of friends rallying zestily, not competitors striving to win. To enjoy the rally *is* to win, for both parties, and it requires cooperation from both. Should the rally continue and flourish (Stage 2), it might come to produce some moment felt as especially delightful or productive (a new technique born, perhaps)—that’s our Stage 3, so to speak. In the data above, we identified this Stage 1 “return of serve” as Ike’s comment in lines 8 and 9, which, not surprisingly (for a “demonstration of difference”), begins with “but.” We found salience and subtlety, both, in this naturally-occurring exemplification of our caricature, “I’m not so sure about that” which is implied in Ike’s question, if not stated.

Another marked relevance (to the arena of teaching and learning) of our data is that the exchange—unlike a dyadic example, perhaps from a phone call, which Linell (1998) identifies as well-worn context for much of the extant study of talk as dialogue—features multiple parties, as would be found in a classroom or training setting. Thereby, it is not Ike, but another participant, NP, whom we pointed to as first exemplifying the move we call “Stage 2: Difference is Engaged and Sustained” (p. 156), in her response starting on line 15: “but when you talk about conflict do you mean. . . .” NP, by this question, advances the repartee into deeper levels (hence she keeps the tennis ball not just in play, but makes the rally more interesting and productive), contesting, even, Louise’s possibly overgeneralized idea of *conflict*.

In our study, we completed our model with “Stage 3: the Emergence of New Meaning,” such that “It is not that B has come to understand A, or vice versa, but that B and A, together, have created something that neither A nor B would have created alone” (p. 157). In the data, we show this in various moments, starting with Julia’s clarifying advancement in line 25, “intellectual conflict not emotional conflict.” Here Julia has significantly enlarged the discussion of online conflict by solidifying the dichotomous view that transcends the original point being made by Louise, regarding her warning that the online teacher take care to avoid the occurrence of “flaming,” even as conflict, itself, is not necessarily inappropriate. Dom, we noted, adds to the ongoing progression into new territory (taking the tennis rally from grass to clay?), by proposing a psychological basis for conflict-turned-flame (not just a warning against), as he offers that e-mail (which was not even the modality of communication being discussed) “releases the id.”

Those are the three stages we thusly presented and portrayed in the original article (Craig & Zizzi, 2007). And, of note, this initial article includes in its title the qualifier “toward” for a reason: we presented the model as an exploratory foray in the *direction of* developing an analytic heuristic that theorists might “ponder” indeed, such that we, if successful, would be “showing the potential for productive ‘dialogue’ between normative and descriptive studies” (p. 153).

My intent, in this present chapter, is to not just ponder, but to test and further refine the model as it has since evolved, with the three stages to be illuminated, through three separate and carefully selected (for contrast) “moments of meeting” (or not), culled from the semester-long corpus of data at my disposal. In this way, my study parallels, in fact, the “triangulation,” espoused and utilized by Miriam Locher (2004), who likewise wrote a book-length study that examines three illustratively contrasting episodes of “disagreement in oral communication,” toward a refinement of existing theory, namely politeness theory.

Analogous to my own approach, Locher (2004) explains that her three-cornered perspective is not intended, so much, as a means of pinpointing the subject (as in geometric triangulation), as it is a means of avoiding any indication of presenting a strictly dichotomous view of the subject under investigation. Indeed, she clarifies that there are numerous prospective and varying “situations” for oral disagreement—each with special features and effects upon the disagreeing talk—and to contrast three such speech situations emphasizes this variability better than would contrasting just two situations, a point I appreciate and also mean to bring out, in my work. I will, in fact, invoke Locher in my coming analysis, relevant as she is for her illumination of power

dynamics, as are subtly mediated, during conflict, by moves of politeness, or, as she prefers to say, of moves of *politic*. In other words, I follow Locher in aiming to show that one critical need for the productive engagement of difference, within my own setting of teaching and learning, is some form of attention to face needs among those involved. I prefer not to differentiate these involved parties as being either students or teachers. Rather, owing to my desire to blur the roles of teacher and learner, as desired of communication theory if not of traditional pedagogy, I will prefer to study the parties as simply *interlocutors*, indeed, as “partners in dialogue.” Because of this move toward mutuality, it becomes all the more important to see in, Locher, the distinguishing characteristic between *politic*, as opposed to *polite*, communication. This is the teleological orientation of *politic* toward relational “equilibrium” (p. 74), not as a strategy for the advancement of ego, as is, she states, the marked move of *politeness*.

With orienting reference provided, as regards the purpose and origin of the Pragmatics of Dialogue model and its orienting metaphor—“Tennis, anyone?”—I will now strive to both employ and refine the stages in closer detail and deeper analysis than was possible in the previous exploratory treatments. It is important to note another distinction between those two foundational articles and this present study: the goal of the originating articles was to present an exploratory model of the pragmatics of dialogue, across any and all contexts, not, as is the present case, to flesh out a model of dialogue expressly applicable to contexts of teaching and learning. Following these three sections of analysis, and revision as warranted by analysis, I will present, in summary, the revised model as it has, through this study, emerged, firmed up, generally, by richer analysis and

augmented by interviewing data, and also adapted specifically to the arena of teaching and learning.

Case 1: Deciding upon a Time to Hold the Participants' Weekly Online Chats

Here, then, is an examination of the first segment for analysis, toward enriching the theoretical basis and practical understanding of these three stages. This exchange (complete transcript presented as Training Session Excerpt 2 in Appendix D) occurred about 15 minutes into the very first session, among the 11 recorded training sessions. The leader of this project, Nora (or NP) has been presenting a structural overview of the course that has now begun. One issue of scheduling that had yet to be worked out involves the time of week during which to hold the weekly one-hour, “synchronous” online group sessions (akin to live chats) among the group (or whomever might show up—as things worked out, these sessions shrank in importance and were less and less attended). Here, in the initial session, Nora is therefore moving to establish a time for these “synchronous sessions,” a time that will work well for the dozen or so participants in attendance at this first session (some members are missing, others will come and go as the semester progresses).

- | | | |
|----|-------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | NP | . . . so it was- it was an interactive |
| 2 | | screen. So Julia and I have had experience |
| 3 | | last fall. Um, so the only piece of this |
| 4 | | course that we hadn't pre-thought was any |
| 5 | | kind of telephone interaction. But the |
| 6 | | online- the online hour can be <i>any</i> time. But |
| 7 | | we do- we DO want it to be a synchronous |
| 8 | | online. So what do you think about that? Do |
| 9 | | you all have a - |
| 10 | Vijay | 6 a.m. |
| 11 | NP | 6 a.m.! (laughter) |

12 Dom How 'bout the grad students? What are your
 13 schedules?
 14 Jason I'm better towards the end of the week.
 15 NP I mean, does anyone have like a lunch hour?
 16 Are you all- 'cause we could do a- Julia, do
 17 you have any lunch hour?

For evidence of any of these three stages, starting with Stage 1: Moves that work to *create discursive openings*, that make space for the engagement of difference, it is important to remember that, in naturally occurring discourse, unlike scripted dialogue, the talk examined is oriented to the event happening, not to some model. This means (as indicated in the chapter's revised look at Peg's Protest) that the analyst will have to both interpret and argue for the interpretation. In this case, I would consider the very first response in the transcript, by Vijay in line 10, (remember it is not the serve, but the return of serve that indicates the onset of dialogue, as Stage 1) as a move that creates discursive opening, though with some subtlety. NP, in line 6, has stated (and the italics in the transcript indicates some special "attitudinal shift" for emphasis), that the time they might settle on, as a group, can be "*any time*." Vijay, who knows NP quite well, as her assistant, is, I believe, moving to lightheartedly expose that she is not altogether sincere with her remark that the meeting could be held at *any time*, through his proposal of 6 a.m. NP's startled reaction reveals that this joke has taken her by surprise, and notice that it is at this surprise that participant laughter is heard, not at Vijay's original jest. The effect of his joke is to say "You don't really mean that, do you?" In other words, he is exploiting the opening for contestation of what NP has offered.

Right here, at this very first interpretive moment of analysis, a weakness in the model surfaces, one which I shall now strive to remedy. Imagine that Vijay had said, instead, as his move to test NP's actual scheduling latitude, something *not* couched in a humorous register, something more direct, such as "You know it can't be held at *any* time—when do you really want to do this? It's going to be on your terms, since you're the boss, regardless of how you soften the point by asking for our preference." That would be a very similar move, pragmatically, although it would be much stronger in its intensity. So the first place to firm up the model being here used and tested is to note varying degrees of intensity, and that these degrees matter, especially in light of politeness theory, including Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness requirement centering upon the avoidance of face threatening acts, and the updated politeness theory of Locher (2004), who, often citing Richard Watts—whom she thanks in her book's acknowledgments as her "mentor" (p. v)—critiques Brown and Levinson's strategies as indeed representing a marked, not neutral, speech act, one that serves, strategically, the needs of ego. That is, there are strategic advantages (e.g., appearing as altruistic) available to the speaker for the necessarily marked (and seen as such by hearer) "surplus information" (a relational statement) imbedded in the display politeness. Locher's preferred move of not the polite (strategic and of benefit to speaker) but of the *politic* (not for advantage but for equilibrium), does not carry this surplus. In other words, Vijay's use of humor softens the prospects for face attack, yet without the marked move of deference that would win him strategic advantage, if not seen-through as obsequious. His move creates discursive opening, by challenging what was last said, yet it does so in a very subtle degree.

Already, the pragmatics of dialogue model, as it has latest stood, needs refinement, as this analysis shows, by way of the addition of a sense of *degree* to the intent—Austin’s (1962) illocutionary force—of the dialogic move, as well, depending upon the analyst’s purpose, has a degree as to the effect—Austin’s (1962) perlocutionary force. Recalling Locher’s (and my own, following) move to avoid the appearance of a dichotomy, by presenting not just two, but three, instance of a variable that is perhaps infinite, I propose to respond to this demonstrated need of the model by offering that each of the three stages be regarded as functioning at one of three levels: low, medium, or high. In fact, since the speech act under consideration indeed centers on displays of difference, which in and of themselves risk automatic interpretation by Hearer as a face-threatening act, I would like to import into this three-level system, a metaphor of temperature, such that low, medium, and high, becoming, thereby, cool, warm, and hot.

A Stage 1 move, that of creating discursive space for the engagement of difference, if hot, cannot be missed, as in the counterexample I proposed for Vijay, above: “You know it can’t be held at *any* time—when do you really want to do this?” Locher (2004) presents various charts, headed “relational work,” to compare the ranges in degree and valence (positive or negative) and associated names of three levels within the ranges, of a number of different politeness models (separate models, all from the early-to-mid 90s, (e.g., separate models by of Watts, Kaspar, Fraser, and Meier, along with Brown & Levinson and others still) visually paralleling the kind of range I am proposing through my designations of cool, warm and hot. The terms vary, by author cited, but the commonality shown in the charts is a general range, within politeness theory, from rude to non-polite (which is neutral; recall, for Locher, politeness is marked speech), and

polite, with her politeness working at both of the non-rude levels. In agreement with Locher's summary, I would say that my "hot" level of intensity runs the risk, in Stage 1, depending on the skill and attentiveness of prospective "partners in dialogue," of perceived rudeness, and my "cool" level, in contrast, runs the risk of being missed, and the opened space thereby goes unnoticed and thereby unused. Too hot or too cool can be a problem.

In the present data excerpt, I propose that Vijay's "6 a.m." represents a "warm" level of opening a space for difference, raised from a status of cool (this, the effect of humor used) by the fact that he interrupted NP in making his jest. A "warm" move of opening is not so likely to be missed, especially if someone wants to engage, and, indeed, the opening is not missed in this case, as Dom responds by inquiring of the schedules of the (relatively low ranking) graduate assistants, in lines 12-13: "How 'bout the grad students? What are your schedules?," a discursive opening I would also rate as medium level, or "warm," in that the move can scarcely be missed, but it is neither likely to be taken as hostile or rude, as might, by way of comparison, be a retort such as, "Are we going to ignore the grad students, as usual?" Lest this invented exemplar seem too far past reasonable, in context, even as a "hot" opening (can't be missed and possibly risks offense, or at least a threat to face), let us not miss that Jason, one of the three grad students (particularly the one chosen and brought in by Dom, as Dom's own designated graduate assistant), offers that he is "better towards the end of the week," a utterance that NP, the original asker, responds to through the clarification that she means, at the moment, time of day, not time of week, saying "I mean, does anyone have like a lunch hour?" and

then proceeds to steer the decision making (a process that she began, recall, by stating that this could happen at “any time”) into people’s lunch hours, as shown below:

18 NP I mean, does anyone have like a lunch hour?
 19 Are you all- 'cause we could do a- Julia, do
 20 you have any lunch hour?

21 Julia I eat lunch every day. (she laughs)

22 NP But, I mean, you don't have a course.

23 Julia No, I don't-

24 NP Does everybody have a- does anybody not have
 25 a course at lunch?

26 Jason I have a course on Tuesdays and Thursdays
 27 from 12:30 to 1:45.

28 Ike Yeah, me too.

29 NP So could we do a- could we do a Monday or a
 30 Friday lunch- online?

31 Jason Friday?

32 Ike We're in the middle of faculty recruitment.
 33 So we often have chalk talks (()) I might-
 34 I might have to miss some- Probably done by
 35 Febru-

36 NP Is it more- is it more likely on Friday or
 37 on Monday?

38 Ike Uh, it's more likely on Friday. But I'll be
 39 done at the end of February.

40 NP So would Monday at lunch work for- everyone?
 41 That we could have a synchronous online?
 42 Let's do Monday at lunch- that's- that's
 43 fine for me.

Returning to my analytic intent of showing the stages of the current Pragmatics of Dialogue model, and now, also showing degrees (cool, warm, hot) within the stages, I must briefly acknowledge, in a Bakhtinian sense and also a common tenet of discourse analysis, that every utterance can be said to both latch onto its predecessor and make

space for its subsequent response. If this point can be held as universally true, all the stronger becomes the case for noting degree, which then allows for judgments of significance, a requirement included in even the very first presentation of the model, in Craig and Zizzi, 2007 (e.g. that not just difference, but *significant* difference, be perceived (by hearer) and then demonstrated back.

In this sense, I would identify NP's question to Julia (in lines 19-20) "a – Julia, do you have any lunch hour?" as not just another among an infinite, Bakhtinian, series of openings, but as an example, as was Dom's, of Stage 2, "difference is sustained/maintained"—that is, the door that "opened" in Stage 1, is *propped* open in Stage 2, not to abruptly swing closed, as might be the case in a simple example of IRE/F "dialogue," with the third move in IRE/F (evaluation/feedback), made by the teacher, says Cazden (2001), and representing apt control of the conversational flow of turn-taking, indeed, thereby, a move of closure, so as to move onto something new.

Yet, notice, in any such case, that the move of closure is thereby also a move of opening (to the new topic), even as that "opening" moves to abort the original nascent dialogue topic, nipping it in the bud prior to the prospective Stage 3, the emergence of new meaning. Here, our model shows, pragmatically, what other critics of IRE/F as "dialogue" (several cited in Chapter 2) decry more ideologically: there is no new meaning emerging in IRE/F, just an affirmation by the teacher that the student has replied in the "right" way (or in the "wrong" way, if the evaluation is negative, as in "no, Janey, that is not what I mean").

Alas, I have scarcely begun testing the pragmatics model, and it is already leaking. To wit, every opening is a closing of something else, and every closing is an opening to something new. The solution to this problem lies in the backing away from the text to see its larger intent, thusly to be able to characterize the larger dialogue topic, and in it, to see where, in the main, things might (or might not) get opened, get sustained (or not) and, possibly generate new (to the participants, in context) new meanings, as I will now proceed to show, returning to the case at hand.

In line 19-20, NP, the director, asks of Julia, the graduate assistant, "Julia, do you have any lunch hour?" NP, in my view, is actually closing off the idea of difference, revealing a strong bias toward a lunchtime meeting, a bias that Vijay had "coolly" (attending to NP's face needs), yet surely, reacted to, opening, through his ironic humor (proposing 6 a.m.). The space that NP suggested was there ("the online hour can be *any time*") is now showing as not really there, as she is, indeed pushes for a noon meeting. So where do we place Julia's reply, in line 21, "I eat lunch every day. (she laughs)." This, I would call a move of Stage 2, maintaining difference, even as this difference is under threat of closure by NP, who, to be fair, has to get a time set and does not have all day to "dialogue" about it, though she couched her opening question in those terms, such that "any" time could work—any time, as long as it's lunch hour, evidently.

So we have another leak in the model. One person's dialogue is another person's need for prompt decision, which requires more agreement than difference. This is not a problem to Ellsworth (1997); it simply affirms her point that typical and relatively shallow understandings of dialogue (and Ellsworth accuses Buburles, her selected

representative of traditional views of dialogue, of this very shortsightedness) miss the richness of power complexities playing out, a richness that, in order to be accounted for, must open up to allow for decision, debate, and dialogue to not be seen as forms of talk that might alternate in discourse, as Burbules and others (such as Ellinor & Girard, 1999, following Bohm, Senge, and Issacs) propose, generally. That that “first we will dialogue, then we will discuss”)—maybe in one sufficiently long exchange or maybe across time in a larger sense, such as ideas from Week 1 resurfacing in Week 10).

No, we cannot see these forms as alternating, says Ellsworth, but, indeed intersecting (in a postmodern sense of irreconcilable discontinuities), as my example above demonstrates. Julia, hoping to preserve her lunch hour, wants to dialogue; NP, feeling the understandable need for a decision made sooner than later, wants to discuss and decide expediently, and the two modes are not alternating in the text above, but intersecting. I will finish this seemingly tangential, yet tellingly central point before concluding my analysis of Training Excerpt 2, itself. For the pragmatics model to stop leaking, all we need do is, as before proposed, step back from it, as Ellsworth would have us do, and appreciate the complexity of dialogue, even as we mean to simplify by placing moves in stages. Multiple levels of meaning making are—indeed—in “dialogue,” and therein we see, most pronouncedly “difference engaged”! The model has not leaked itself empty; indeed, it has leaked out merely the diluting simplicity, to help show, robustly, what communication theory, has to offer.

To recap, and also present new meaning—Stage 3, in a meta-analytic sense—NP offered, and politeness theory appreciates the “hedge” against a bald face threat (as in, “We are going to meet, synchronously, during your lunch hours, people”), a token of

openness, even though her managerial duty requires, in a normal understandable sense, expedience, a shallow token that Vijay humorously responded to, commencing the dialogue. Dom tried to escort it along (Stage 2), but Julia's relative lack of positional power could not maintain Stage 2, under NP's pressure to decide and move on, and, as Ike, a professor, clarified (in lines 32-38) that the only workable lunch hour for him would have to be Monday, then Monday at lunchtime became the "any time" of the synchronous chat, with several of the present players not weighing in at all, which was all the more expedient for NP.

Yes, a plan was made, but for any critic of this model who would challenge that the simple making of a plan (erstwhile "dialogic" "productivity") does not constitute anything special enough to warrant a special and idealized name (dialogue), here is a place of acknowledgment of that. Yes, a plan was made, but I would not only hesitate to call it in any way *innovative*, I would further point out that the Monday online chats never came to any real fruition, as became evident at the onset of Peg's momentous protest (see, also line 735 in Appendix F, where Peg derides the relatively wasteful "online- whatever- or whatever it is"), which NP had tried, at this onset, to stave off by suggesting that if Peg wanted more technology, she could, and should, have said so when the question was asked two days prior, on the (scarcely attended, in actuality) Monday chat!

Yes, a plan was made, and expediently, and this, I offer, is hardly extraordinary; then again, the plan failed, in effect, and neither, would I offer, is that extraordinary, as regards plans that get made for "any time," when any time becomes everyone's lunch hour and these players are already committed to two or more hours per week of unpaid

participation (unpaid for the faculty, anyway, if not the assistants, who were the more regular attendees of the Monday chats) in a workshop not necessarily meeting their needs, until flashpoint—protest—and then dialogue, as is unpacked in detail in the previous chapter, appropriately, as may now be clearer than ever, at the “situational” level. In sum, the pragmatics model shows effectively that Session Excerpt 2 failed, as dialogue, at Stage 2, and, indeed, a high price was paid for the unseen (at the time, except maybe by Julia) lack of dialogic productivity. The schedule was successfully arranged, but few showed up.

Case 2 (with screenshots): Julia Persists, and a Solution Emerges Dialogically

For the sake of chronological coherence in this quasi-ethnographic report—a term I of course use somewhat loosely, not having formally ascribed to ethnographic, *per se*, theoretic and analytic commitments in this qualitative research report, yet having been, as Chapter 3 details, swept fast into the role of participant-observer, living the experience with the participants—I now present my second of two photo essays, as this chapter’s second case for dialogic analysis. If not for the chronology, I would reserve this more innovative form of analysis for the end of the chapter, not to interrupt the flow of analysis anchored more in discourse analysis of transcripts for the first and third cases in this chapter. I hope the reader will not mind the interruption of that more traditional methodology.

As Lindlof and Taylor (2002) assert, a chronologic approach, which “models the text after the phenomenon, itself” (p. 300) is but one alternative for the reporting of qualitative data, especially appropriate in showing developmental processes that happen over time. In this case, I present my nontraditional analytic approach mid-chapter,

interruption of analytic style as it is, because I wish, indeed, to show both the progression of this dialogic event and to set up my study's final segment for analysis, in which the ebb and flow of dialogue might reveal itself as a nonlinear process. Next, then, I will examine a highlight of the training event—indeed a dialogic moment in the larger frame—namely the fruition of opportunity, as Julia's sturdy desire to make a meaningful contribution to the group, her self-admitted “lowly” status as a PhD student among tenured faculty, notwithstanding. After this section, I will return to analysis of transcripts, to examine a late-stage event in the training to see whether the event's flow, toward what Pernelle (1998) labels “dialogicality” (p. 89) is maintained toward the end.

In the following passage, which occurred Week 6, just prior to my interview with Julia (hence its prominent mention, since so recent, during our interview), the group, sitting around a conference table, has just finished up the formal part of the day's training, which was a two-way interaction with today's trainers, who were located in another videoconferencing room down the hall, emulating a teleconference-style video training and were therefore separated, for demonstration purposes, from the cast of regulars. The “distant” trainers had just concluded their training a few minutes ago, but still appear on a screen in the room (see Screenshot 6.1).



Screenshot 6.1: *The videoconference has ended with some laughs about leaving on the microphone by accident. Clockwise from top left: Dom, Martin, Morningstar, Jason, and NP.*

Along with the speaking live to the group, the trainers had also been showing excerpts of videos (segments taken from television shows), as demonstrations on the subject of the training: how to use video in the classroom. The trainers had a similar video screen in their own room, by which they could view this room's attendees. They are just concluding their training and are signing off the videoconference. The training session is about to end, when Julia brings up a technology issue. (Recall that just last week came "Peg's Protest," calling for more emphasis on technology, a protest already addressed by this week's change of topic (hence the videoconference).

Julia knows that the faculty want more technology, and, as she explains in the interview excerpt transcribed and presented in Appendix E (Interview Excerpt 4), she knows that she has something to offer the group, though she may or may not be taken seriously, given her status, as seen in lines 179-188 of the interview transcript.

MZ And you were saying, as a PhD student in a room with- have faculty, do you think that's pretty much uh- the expected uh play-out of a discussion?

Julia You know, it's been hit or miss for me. *Some* people who have their PhDs, who are faculty members or researchers or something, are very- like they see value that graduate students are bringing in their experiences and their ideas and stuff as something that's value added. And then there are other professors who- really- don't expect anything- s- anything *substantive* from you because you're just a PhD student.

55 Peg What I'm gonna be *trying* to do. I mean one-
 56 in one configuration of this *course*, they're
 57 sitting in a room with a screen and they
 58 watch a whole movie. [Jason: right] But then
 59 when we *discuss* the movie I want to be able
 60 to excerpt little parts and say "okay now,
 61 this is the scene where *this* happens" and so
 62 on-

63 Ike But there's also free software you can get,
 64 that allows you to- to edit movies and cut
 65 out clips [Peg: uh-huh] and save them as
 66 individual clips.

In terms of the Pragmatics model, the conversation above has yet to see anything take root, at any *temperature* or intensity, though the specific issue is coming clearer and clearer: how to switch from one tech format to another during a class lecture. Ike, in lines 63-66, above, is offering a possible solution, but it is not one that the other faculty are prepared to follow up on, lacking his background and even the equipment (Apple computers) that he refers to. His input, thereby, has a general utility to it, but not to his interlocutors: right message, wrong audience. We cannot see this as *dialogic*, per the mandates of the Pragmatics model, and yet, intuitively, the dialogue (in the general sense of "group talk") is indeed taking form, which does constitute *development*, and though multiple perspectives—even difference, oddly engaged. I point to this as a possible shortcoming in the Pragmatics model, as it now stands. Something is happening that is *dialogic*, per the interest and intent of the model, yet this something cannot be pointed to by the language and mechanisms of the model, like a dictionary missing important words.

To this point, the "dictionary" (the Pragmatics model) has gained, though the analysis above, a vocabulary of intensity—the model's three stages now available to the analyst as cool, warm or hot. But the model lacks terminology for developments that are,

at their richest essence, exemplary of the very foundation of the constitutive perspective of communication claimed, in Chapter 1 and thereafter, as the metatheoretic bedrock of this study—that is, how to dissect passages of talk where, the talk, itself, moreso than individuals engaged in it, is ostensibly doing the moving. To wit, there is a discernible development underway, but it seems more constructed by the group, as a whole, than as a function of specific and constructive acts of pragmatics, of speakers speaking and of listeners listening, in any orderly or even predicable fashion.



Screenshot 6.3: *Julia has checked out of the din, unfulfilled by the talk, and is now attending closely to her laptop, as the conversation continues to migrate.*

What is developing and available, but, to this point yet to congeal, is, firstly, a clear understanding of the practical issue at hand—the specific technical challenge faced by one or more participants and, secondly, a simple solution to this challenge. This is a discussion (in a formal setting of teaching and learning) that is wandering of its own accord, rather than one directed toward a specific learning outcome. In other words, it is simply happening, free-form: the talk is taking its own shape, because nobody knows

what else to do. The planned training seems finished, but the clock disagrees (there remain about 18 minutes left in the scheduled, two-hour session), and Nora, who exerts a strong sense of running the show, generally (this, clear from the first session, as was demonstrated in the previous piece of analysis, regarding the setting of a time for the online chat) has yet to dismiss the group. So there is time left on the clock, and that, itself, short of direction otherwise, makes a space for talk, if nonpurposeful. Thusly arises a compelling and relevant question: can nonpurposeful, unstructured discourse, in a setting of teaching, find its way to form, to productivity, to the accomplishment of course objectives, no less? Let us investigate further.

Beginning in line 67 below (the excerpt taken from lines 92-122 in Training Session Excerpt 5), Dom is working his way toward a cogent understanding and description of a problem he experiences. Ike's response beginning on line 72 does connect to Dom's explanation of his problem, but not usefully, so I would not count that as indicative of a robust grasp of Dom's problem. In fact, Ike's remark functions well as an exemplar of engagement at the level, *cool*. It is there, but not doing a lot. In mild contrast, an utterance below that I would say portrays a warmer *uptake*, that is, a response that verifies, for the speaker, the fidelity with which a hearer has understood an utterance (Drew, 1992) is Martin's comment in line 75, acknowledging Dom's point: Martin understands that Dom has a real problem, in the practice, as regards technology, especially, of teaching.

Other than Martin's affirmation that Dom is experiencing technological distress, the larger effect of the scattered conversation is minimized by its apparent lack of direction—Buber's dialogic mandate for presentness, unfulfilled, though physically

present, the group is—and Ike is meanwhile deferring to his well-worn stance, made repeatedly throughout the training, that, for multimedia purposes, McIntosh computers are superior to PC types. NP does make (lines 82-83) a relevant remark, so, yes, some signs of listening are surfacing—again, I would call this at the cool level, but we surely see no hot or even very warm engagement, at least not yet.

We might have seen this engagement heat right up, given the topic generally prevailing, as regards the help that Julia had bid to provide, but she has now checked out of the conversation, having been largely ignored. What is most telling, as regards the general disconnect, and yet with a migratory kind of directionality, that I am pointing to in the segment below, is Dom's response in line 95. Many times he has endured Ike's talk about the advantage of "Macs" and, whereas I believe he has no intention of switching computers, the nature of Ike's comments—the only person really listening to him, leaves him with nothing else to say but the gratuitous acknowledgement, "Maybe I will get a Mac." He appears frustrated, and the conversation is not going anywhere particularly useful.

- | | | |
|----|--------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 67 | Dom | Yeah, my <i>concern</i> was that I'm lecturing and |
| 68 | | doing PowerPoint- I got the image and text |
| 69 | | up and then I say "Oh and let me show you a |
| 70 | | clip of Martin Luther King's speech"- |
| 71 | Ike | (interrupting and overlapping Dom's last few |
| 72 | | words) You can <i>import</i> things- you can |
| 73 | | import- you can- you can <i>embed</i> a QuickTime |
| 74 | | movie into PowerPoint. |
| 75 | Martin | (softly) That can be problematic- |
| 76 | Dom | And <i>he</i> said it was a <i>risk</i> - he said 'cuz you |
| 77 | | could- |
| 78 | Ike | Yeah because Windows- Windows software is |
| 79 | | designed to screw you up. |

80 (Ike and NP start talking simultaneously,
 81 then NP breaks through)

82 NP I have a little mov- I have a little *tiny*
 83 movie in my PowerPoint on learning styles
 84 [Dom: yeah- yeah- yeah] when the bridge goes
 85 (())

86 Ike So it's doable.

87 M'star What about just-

88 Ike Could get- could get a new Mac and run it
 89 with-'cause the *new* ones can run Windows at
 90 the same time as- as the- so you can run
 91 both.

92 Dom Maybe I should *do* that and-

93 Ike 'Cause they *do*. You can run both, 'Cause
 94 they're both, you know (())

95 Dom Maybe I will get a Mac

96 Ike They're too easy. You won't like it (laughs)

97 Dom Are they? (several people laugh)



Screenshot 6.4: *Peg explains that she would settle for lower resolution of the video she shows in class, if it means more ease of use and continuity in the presentation.*

In the excerpt below, from lines 206-241 in Training Excerpt 5, Peg is now (starting at line 98) finding a better way to explain her predicament, which actually parallels Dom's: the sparks of uptake are beginning to accrue, perhaps to ignite. Peg explains her technical issue, if in a nontechnical way; meanwhile, Julia, evidently, had been trying to figure out how to demonstrate what she has wanted to share, but now seems to have given up, as she closes up her laptop. Ike responds to Peg, beginning at line 69, in the way he understands, though no one else seems to, and Dom is meanwhile starting to grasp—interjecting affirmations in lines 107 and 114—that Peg's problem is also his problem. To this point, this entire disjointed conversation has lacked a meaningful nature that could be labeled any warmer than cool, as an example of Stage 1, where discursive space is opened to difference. Things begin to warm, though, through Peg's crystallization in lines 116-117 of what has bubbled under the surface for most of this wandering talk, a shared problem: how to switch multimedia formats on the fly during lecture. In clarifying her dilemma (yet this clarification arises more as a product of the group's vague movement than of anything substantially individual), she clearly invites more meaningful response.

98	Peg	Well, going back to your thing- with changing, I was doing that
99		course, which you (to Morningstar) were in, and, so- I mean,
100		here's the scenario <i>I</i> envision. So you've got'chure- your little
101		DVD with your clips on it. Then- and it's <i>all</i> lined up, and you're
102		gonna do it <i>in</i> order. And then, you get to, like the <i>third</i> clip, and it
103		goes back to [Ike: the beginning] the <i>first</i> , or you gotta go back to
104		the menu- or- I mean it's just extremely <i>frustrating</i> .
105		It interrupts everything in the class, and so, in- for <i>me</i> , there's a
106		way in which <i>I'm</i> willing to take the trade-off of lower resolution,
107		to have the- you know, the continuity of <i>one</i> [Dom: exactly] DVD
108		and (clears throat) you know it- the way I'm thinking about <i>my</i>
109		class, <i>that's</i> not where they're- in that <i>clip</i> - that's not where they're

- 110 looking at the movie. That's where they're *talking* about the movie
 111 [Ike: right] And so if it isn't perfect, that- I don't care.
- 112 Ike Then you could have save those as individual files. Like, you
 113 know, this is the first clip I want to show, this is the second clip
 114 [Dom: right], this is the third clip. [Julia: mm-hmm] So that you're
 115 *not-* you're not trying to move around in a big huge file.
- 116 Peg Right, no, I want it like in *one* place where it just- like goes "click"
 117 and there's the next thing, *right* there. You know, *like* a
 118 PowerPoint where you just *click* to go to from page to page?- that
 119 it's embedded in that?- and it's right there. So-



Screenshot 6.5: *Julia attempts to connect her laptop into the room projection system, but NP is about to adjourn the session—a bit prematurely, as it turns out.*

As Ike and Vijay continue speaking (with others commenting, too, including about the frustration of needing to replace laptops every three years—this side conversation noted in my log but too complex and messy for transcription), Julia has now visibly become inspired to re-enter this discussion and to demonstrate her solution, as she has, surprisingly, re-opened her laptop. She gets busy, with haste, reaching back into her case against the wall to retrieve a McIntosh adaptor cord, as seen in screenshot 6.5, preparing to make an impromptu (and uninvited) demonstration if possible, using the

room's main projector and screen. Recall, this is the first training session since what I have labeled Peg's Protest, and it markedly featured a lively focus on the use of technology in teaching, just as Peg and Dom, especially, had been wanting, and as Julia embraces. This is her stuff, her generational advantage weighing against her positional disadvantage, in term of status. She is, in a sense, portraying an important point made by Peg in her interview (in lines 746-751 of Appendix F) of just a few days prior, that the teacher, nowadays (if lacking some technical skill), can (with a hope and a prayer) use student expertise from the class, to get past the technological sticking point. It may not look good, but it is preferable to failure.

About now, NP makes a remark of frustration, in lines 120-121 below (this next excerpt taken from Training Excerpt 6, lines 123-164). Dom, however, is gaining increased clarity, as this end-of-session conversation, disjointed as it has been, is now starting to find coherence, aided by Martin's interjection, in line 128, that the quality of the video used in lecture will be much better, if not imbedded in PowerPoint, a process that nobody has really understood so far. That is, Peg's willingness to trade picture quality for ease of use is a false dilemma. Notice that Martin's comment is not an utterance that naturally follows from what had most recently been uttered; rather it connects back to Dom's earlier point, made in lines 122-126, which Julia had, at that moment affirmed with her interjected and confirming "Yeah." Julia gets it, and Martin has picked up on it, with added confirmation by NP (line 131); that is, Martin is seemingly responding both to Dom's idea and Julia's affirmation, having thought about it, though his response arrives out of sequence in the conversation.

Until this point, I would argue that the whole group has accomplished little, through talk, but now the dialogue becomes energized, and I would call Mark's comment the clearest-cut, so-far, indicator of Stage 1—he has created a space for Julia to retry—to find on her laptop a way of demonstrating what Dom has wanted to gain from the workshop, namely some practical solution to some technical problem, and the problem that arose in the unstructured talk centers on difficulties experienced with switching media smoothly during lecture. I have, in the preceding paragraphs, wrestled with difficulties in acknowledging the pragmatics of this unstructured discursive engagement, and I have not been able to show this engagement clearly, as dialogic, in terms of the Pragmatics model. Now, things are warming up—and with quite a new, welcomed twist.

Considering how little Martin has said, during this whole exchange, one would not expect him to be the one whose comment would energize the dialogue. Yet I judge that it is right about at that moment (lines 138 and 141) whence the most *productive* passage from all of this loose-knit, preliminary, yet essential, discussion has now opened up, with Martin now opening a space for Julia to demonstrate her “difference”—that is, to share what she, alone—as a low-status member of the group but a high-status member, relatively, as a member of the younger, digital generation—understands as the solution to Dom's problem.

The new feature emerging in this analysis, this lengthy test-drive of the Pragmatics model, is the demonstrated *disconnect* between quantity and quality. I will say that I had noticed something along these lines, in observing Martin, all term: now I can better point to it, and the model regains analytic utility, even in this time of unstructured, hard to isolate, utterances. The model cares not about the bulk of an

utterance, just its pragmatic effect. Martin exemplifies the *efficient dialogist*! He adds what the dialogue needs, not just what he might have handy on the tongue to add.

So Julia's difference, to be now *warmly*, but soon *hotly*, demonstrated makes its own telltale point: her *difference* is not ideological nor cultural, rather it is one of different knowledge. I am reminded of Currie's (2004) lighthearted generalization at the fore of his volume parsing difference, itself: however theorized, difference, at its core, *is simply not the same as*. Yes, there are differing significances: 1 is less different from 2 than it is from 2,000. But the point works both ways. A social critic might desire difference in one sociocultural form or another (depending upon agenda: difference in ethnicity, difference in religion, difference in socio-economic background, in sexuality, in age, in this, in that, or in the other), but in teaching and learning, generally, one natural and always viable and prominent form of difference is simply a difference in *know-how*.

- 120 NP Who ever thought, when you studied history,
121 you'd have to become a film technician?
- 122 Dom (shaking his head) No kidding. Well- but
123 again- um- Cleve warned me *not* to do all
124 this dragging and dropping into my
125 PowerPoint. To bring a separate CD, and pop
126 it into the DVD player [Julia: yeah] And
127 then when I'm ready to show that clip, at
128 least I have it there I just- I just *change*
129 the *projector*, actually. You know I change
130 the settings.
- 131 NP: That's what I do, and *usually* it works
- 132 Dom Yeah, but-
- 133 NP About every other third time (laughs) the
134 DVD won't work on the DVD player (laughs)-
- 135 Peg (to Dom) And what was the *reason* your
136 PowerPoint would be *what*?
- 137 Dom He thinks-

138 Martin The quality would be *much*, much better-
 139 NP Yeah, the quality is much better
 140 Peg The DVD quality.
 141 Martin Much better.
 142 Vijay But that is a- that's *improving* though,
 143 isn't it, with PowerPoint?
 144 Martin You still can't match DVD quality inside a
 145 PowerPoint-
 146 Vijay Yeah but there is- there *is* something to be
 147 said for being able to have *one* thing
 148 [Julia: yeah], and not have to deal with
 149 other machines-

Now, in an a notably warm-and-growing-warmer fashion, we better see the emergence of Stage 2—the vital *sustaining* of difference—which quickly, in this instance, morphs into Stage 3, the creation of new meaning, and it is a meaning—an understanding—that Julia did not have available to share (she needed a clearer sense of the problem, first) nor did anyone else knew of it, period. Meanwhile, and ironically, NP attempts, in lines 152-154, to finally dismiss the group, who is now becoming increasingly “warmed,” dialogically, into Stage 3, by Julia’s demonstration. With a crowd gathered behind her, including NP, due to the appeal of this breakthrough, Julia finally has the floor and is enjoying the measure of respect (perhaps self-respect) that she has sought (see Julia’s interview, circa line 215) throughout this training program.



Screenshot 6.8: *Simultaneous to Martin's utterance, Julia is still talking to the group. They are still huddled around he, observing and listening to her explanation.*

Before moving to this chapter's final data segment for analysis, we should examine the pragmatic moves, now more readily discernible, as the interaction now has clearer focus and direction, that facilitated Julia's "alt-tab breakthrough." This dialogic product—hot, in Stage 3, with applications both conceptual and practical, and possibly even relational, as Dom comes into great appreciation for Julia—represents a simple, powerful, and, thereby, elegant fix to the problem experienced by Dom and Peg, both. Dom did not need a Mac, he needed a way to bring forth from Julia her solution to his problem, and that way turned on group input, group difference, group process: dialogue. So let us not miss the key moves, in Stage 2, sustained engagement of difference, as it congealed and opened space for Stage 3. For the sake of methodological variety, I will point out these moves, in this short but rich passage, line by line.

150 Julia (to Martin) Will this show my computer?

Above, Julia asks for help, where she needs it: a Stage-1 move, perhaps, if we want to bound the dialogue (ever boundless, says Bakhtin) by the confines of this excerpt.

151 (NP gains the floor, to dismiss the group)
 152 NP Okay, well I think it's past time, [Julia:
 153 oh, it is?] and I think and we should
 154 probably wrap up the-

Julia “hedges” (Locher, 2004) her possible face-threatening act (of defying NP’s suggestion to break for the week) through a brief, interjected questioning of the need to disband at this moment. She is not defying, she is asking for information, much less threatening, yet it buys time and consideration, as things develop hastily.

155 Dom This was interesting.

Dom puts out a positive comment, even though his issue has not yet been resolved, as a token of appreciation for NP's responsiveness to Peg's Protest (which we have come to understand better, as "NP's invitation for Peg's Protest"). Privately, Dom had helped to fuel Peg's Protest through mid-week communication with Peg (references to which appear in the transcribed segments of interviews with both Dom and Peg), but it was NP who made the space for it, as was shown.

156 (the next few turns overlap, as people seem
157 confused as to whether the session is
158 actually over)
159 NP This was fun and this-

NP joins in the acknowledgment that the session, now made technological, has been a change for the better. This alleviates possible guilt among the protesters and shows *openness*, a Buberian mandate for dialogue.

160 Julia (to Dom) Oh forget it, yeah. I was gonna
161 show you how- I can show you this-

Julia attends to Dom's need for Brown and Levinson's (1987) negative face: the need to not have one's actions imposed upon. She gives him the choice of seeing the demonstration or not.

162 Ike Let's do that, and I gotta meet-
163 Dom Yeah-

Dom opts to see the demo, following Ike's support, gestured though his time is tight. Ike is on board without needing to maintain his prior stance: again, openness is both shown and contagious. This works to mitigate any residual tension between the two men.

164 Julia (As Julia speaks and clicks her mouse, a
165 crowd begins to gather behind her.) Yeah,
166 this is just like- this is an example of it.
167 Here's a PowerPoint [Dom: Here's your a
168 PowerPoint] and you can click through,
169 right. [Dom: right] And you can just alt-
170 tab. And you can alt-tab on your PC, too,
171 and you know, show the movie and then when
172 the movie starts (voice trails off). You
173 know th- my students would see exactly what
174 you're seeing here. I guess I could
175 probably-

Julia talks her way through the demo, aided by supportive tokens by Dom, which, importantly, though with subtlety, engenders her repair (line 130) by which she then refers to "my" students, showing kinship, common ground with Dom, a reciprocal move of Locher's (2004) "politic" of equilibrium, not the more *marked* move of "politeness," which, Locher points out, surreptitiously serves to boost one's own status in the eyes of

the deferred-to interlocutor. She is not “kissing up,” she is identifying.

176 Dom Well *this* is very useful! (gestures, as in
177 relief)

Above shines a stalwart affirmation of a *hot* Stage 3: a brilliantly productive outcome, in concept and in practice, that is, technique. Indeed, it represents the very flowering of Peg’s protest a week prior, which now, in a larger sense, cements, here in Week 6, the remaking of the “situation”—providing a new motivation for attending, a new answer to the situation-framing question, “why am I taking this class?” This event thusly helps to show the reciprocal connection between situation and interaction, the two always (prospectively, at least) making/remaking each other.

178 Martin So next- *next* time what we’re planning on
179 doing, is having- (The group is not
180 listening; they are watching Julia with
181 interest.)

Martin, an aid to NP, particularly as regards technology, contextualizes this clearly valued breakthrough as part of the larger move of NP’s, especially through the repaired phrase, “*next- next* time we’re planning.” The morning’s training had, indeed, been experienced by the group as markedly lively, hi-tech, and indicative of NPs flexibility, that is, her openness, in adapting to Peg’s protest. This, she accomplished through great effort from Mark, hence he, too holds a rightful stake in the re-contextualization of Julia’s breakthrough as part of the “planning.” His comment was

largely unheard by the group, but the person who probably heard it, and appreciated it, is the ever-watchful NP.

NP has indeed bent a lot, and she no-doubt appreciated (if she heard it) the kudos implicit in Martin's move of encompassing this peak moment of the group's into NP's "planning." So *confirmed* (like openness, *confirmation*, a Buberian ideal, dialogically), NP's responsiveness—rich with Levinasian undertones of owing identity to other, the radical alterity embodied in the form of Peg, last week, and Julia, this week—will more likely propagate, just as the impolitic tensions in the following segment of analysis will be seen, next, to propagate negativity. All in all, "Julia's alt-tab breakthrough" stands, along with Peg's Protest, as peak events of dialogue: *dialogic moments* to some, though, as I maintain through the Pragmatics models stages and temperatures alike, to see only the climax is to miss the romance—cool, warm, and hot—that, indeed makes the climax even a possibility.

Case 3: "I Want to have a Dialogue"?

(Excerpt below taken from Appendix D, Training Session Excerpt 8:

1	Miriam	Well a- as a way to begin- uh (pause) I've
2		been doing a lot of reading on the
3		scholarship of teaching- an- so some of it
4		I'm going to talk with you about today. And
5		most important I would- I would like us to
6		have- dialogue. There are some things about
7		this s-s- straightforward and simple as it
8		is that I grasp- intellectually- and other
9		things that I don't grasp. So- some of those
10		things might come up this morning and uh I'd
11		love to have your responses (pause) uh to my
12		understanding or- misunderstanding

The excerpt above formally opened Training Session 10, with, as is clear in the brief passage presented, the presenter's call for "dialogue." This week's speaker, Miriam, has been invited as the university specialist in what is called "the scholarship of teaching and learning" (SOTL), a formal designation for faculty efforts to write scholarly work in their fields, as regards innovations in their pedagogical approaches. It would seem natural, then, that a spokesperson for the publication of innovative teaching practices would, herself, display an apt sensitivity to processes of learning. As she explains in lines 6-9, there are some aspects of her own specialization that she grasps, and other aspects that she would like to grasp more firmly, and she is therefore open to group input; that is, she wants to have a "dialogue."

In consideration of this event in terms of the Pragmatics model, one could scarcely imagine a clearer-cut exemplification of readiness for Stage 1, as she overtly opens discursive space for the engagement of difference. In fact, she goes as far as to state that she would verily "love" to "have" the group's responses "*uh to my understanding or- misunderstanding.*" She literally courts correction. Her opening remark seems to represent a lucid and direct embodiment call for the model's Stage 1, in that, however and whenever as may be seen as appropriate by participants, she would like—make that love—to have her metaphoric "serve returned." In light of the complexity just observed in the previous analytic section—complexity and even contradiction in locating, within a passage of naturally occurring discourse, such clear-cut markers of the model's stages—this seems almost too good to be true, for analytic purposes, anyway.

I propose, therefore, in moving to my analysis of this especially fertile segment of the semester-long training, that such an overt call for a particular form of speech indeed warrants special attention among my corpus of data. Among many analytic possibilities, two figure prominently as prospects. On one hand, perhaps we will see a brilliant example of the very kind of talk we seek to better understand, since a pivotal ground rule has been established—the students have been roundly invited to disagree with the teacher/trainer!—by the leader of the session. This could set up precisely the kind of talk that is the subject of this dissertation: a lively and productive engagement of difference right there where we wonder if it can exist at all, in a special setting that designates one person as “knows it” and the rest as “need to.”

On the other hand, it is possible that, when a teacher/presenter makes the rare metadiscursive move of opening with, “please disagree with me wherever you would,” then something is out of alignment. It could be a challenge: “I dare you.” It could be a cover-up for insecurity as regards the prospects for face-threatening acts: “I fear you may be a hostile crowd, so I will invite you to challenge me, so that when you do, it will look like that is what I wanted, and I will not lose face.” Or it could be a combination of these prospects, along with myriad other possibilities.

I will now proceed to analysis of what I see as the most fertile passages of the discourse that followed this *invitation to dialogue*, starting with an exchange that transpired within the first ten minutes after the invitation was made. Here, Miriam serves up the tennis ball, and Ike is happy to smack it back over the net, and he does do with what tennis mavens call “pace” but what we will, owing to the idea of dialogue, cool, warm, and hot, will call heat. Indeed, there is little that could be called coolness in Ike’s

style, as the group knows well, here in Week 10, and as Miriam, a first-timer this week, is about to find out the hard way (well, she would just *love* to be corrected!)

13 Miriam Have you been *doing*- have you *done*
 14 scholarship of teach- should've asked this
 15 earlier
 16 Ike Yeah- no- I have a *grant* to do this stuff
 17 Miriam I'm sorry?
 18 Ike I have a *grant* to do this stuff- and we
 19 Miriam To do *scholarship*?
 20 Ike Sure- and we also have th- the LA- the LA
 21 test ((data)) based on- evaluating- uh- so I
 22 don't know if you know about that *project*
 23 but that- that's a big three year- three to
 24 *five* year project- it's got one and a half
 25 million dollars' funding and may have
 26 another million dollars coming in-

The passage above (some 7 minutes into her presentation) opens by showing the Miriam's effort to make good on her invitation to engage what her audience might have to offer as regards the subject matter at hand. To remember to ask "Does anyone have experience with what I am talking about?" displays a welcomed, if unremarkable competence in instruction (Palmer, 1998), pure and simple. It is neither a novel nor innovative move, yet it works well to invoke analytic mention as opening space for Stage 1. I would call it, for its conventionality, a *cool* example into Stage 1, prospectively warmer, if couched with any marked openness for *difference*, something along the lines of "Maybe some of you have experienced this differently?" She does not ask for difference, just an example, and this bid harkens, thereby, to IRE/F (shallowest form of pedagogical dialogue), yet it does reveal a bid to transcend monologue, into (or at least

toward) dialogue. The discourse has entered Stage 1 of the Pragmatics model, as Ike returns the serve. The *onset of dialogue* has now occurred, though we have already seen, in this chapter's first segment for analysis, that a dialogue begun is not necessarily a dialogue maintained through to productive fruition.

Key to the perlocutionary force (igniting the flame of dialogue's onset) of Ike's response is the hard-to-transcribe (except for my use of the "attitudinal" italics) *edge* in his word, "*grant*" (line 18). Replaying the passage in my headphones, I cannot say that the *volume* has risen, nor would I note a transcribable change of *pitch*. What I hear is more a contour of changing intensity across an elongated syllable, like the sound of the revving of an engine: *graAant*). As he returns Miriam's serve, we might metaphorically call his intonation a nasty topspin, one prefaced first by "Yeah- no-" this, a noteworthy contradiction: "yeah, (I have experience), but no, (you won't "love" to hear about it)." He not only has *experience*, he has a *graAant*. Indeed, as the group has heard, and often, it is a very large *graAant*, too. Ike is a player within Miriam's own specialization, SOTL, though he has kept quiet about this for a relatively amazing (for him) duration of seven minutes (see protracted utterances transcribed in Training Session Transcript 1, presented there expressly to help support this point of his loquacity).

Ike, is in no way reticent (though he says, in his interview, in Appendix E, on line 17, that groups make him "nervous"), but I restate that the force of this specific utterance comes as much in prosodic *attitude* as it does in semantic content. He does not just have a grant, the implicature in his tone is that he has, let us recast, with some license, if not licentiousness, "a dam--- big grant," an interpretation that helps to explain Miriam's two-word response to his dig: "I 'm sorry?"

What else does the server say, when the ball has been whacked back, with topspin and a slice, right at her feet, practically unreturnable, except through immense technical expertise. And, I argue right here, with this passage as Exhibit 1, that it is expertise, when Stage 1 is *hot*, that allows for Stage 2, else the rally is fast over, and the tenor of the discourse moves away from collaboration and dialogue and toward a competitive match of service aces, overhead slams, embarrassing passing shots, and arguments with the ref. To depart from the metaphor and return to the terminology of discourse analysis, I will state that Ike's intoned response represents a serious threat to Miriam's positive face needs, and so she really *is* "sorry," I surmise, though her response functions not as apology, but more as a neutralizing token, perhaps a move to buy time to regroup, through requesting elaboration (Cameron, 2001). Her ironic apology is but a lob, under pressure, at the net, to show displeasure and to buy time.

With a moment to think, Miriam presents a possible resource toward recouping lost face, by placing her own attitudinal emphasis on the unclear *scholarship* aspect of Ike's grant. Maybe he has funding to test a program, yes, but is he expected to *publish* scholarly material such that analysis of his program becomes available in the scholarly community, as is Miriam's role on this campus to promote? I would call this response, of Miriam's, in line 19, an apt example of what perpetuates my model's Stage 2: it is at least a warm, if not hot, move to sustain, not quell, the heat of the exchange. It's a hard cross-court shot to Ike's backhand, a shot with heat, yet one that keeps the ball in play. Fair enough.

Alas, in this metaphorical court of play, the backhand is where Ike lives; she has hit the ball right to his strength by doubting the scholarly nature of his project. He blisters

his return—still *hot* in Stage 2, assuring her that he is talking about scholarship, and, in doing so, making reference to sums of money smacking of “millions” of dollars. The friendly rally is becoming fierce. Meanwhile, she has created the very space for him to raise the spectre that has (along with the superiority of Macintosh computers over PCs), been Ike’s critical and oft-repeated focus throughout this training event. Ike is the scientist; Ike likes data. Above all Ike values the rigorous testing of outcomes: Ike likes *validity*. Socrates at least was valid. Since Socrates’ time, little has developed to satisfy Ike, as regards pedagogical advancement. Thusly, in her attack, Miriam has actually made a space for Ike’s backhand return down the baseline. This will be a tough “get” for maintaining the rally, as Miriam is about to discover.

- 27 Ike - and *that's* the validity of learning
 28 assistant program [Miriam: m-hm] And uh- so
 29 part of *that* NSF grant is to evaluate
 30 whether those- those- those students have to
 31 take courses in pedagogy [Miriam: m-hm]
 32 (pause) as part of their uh *training*. And
 33 then we're trying to evaluate whether *one*
 34 day- they understand uh- how to do
 35 interactive engagement type of uh
 36 educational processes and to- and to *get*
 37 more Socratic. I- I actually don't believe
 38 there are *any*- advan- advances in education
 39 uh since uh- Socrates died
- 40 Miriam (laughing) *Thank* you
 41 (several in the group join Miriam with a
 42 laugh, and murmurs break out)

It is interesting to note, recalling politeness theory from previous analysis, that, in mitigation of clear and present face threat, Miriam twice now borrows from the most basic vocabulary of *everyday* politeness, using terms (“I’m sorry” and “*thank*

you”) that are parts of what Pomerantz (1984) has termed adjacency pairs. These adjacency pairs normally function as a two-party enactments of social comity: they indicate a polite, or socially expected, gesture of playing by the rules, for the sake of form and the maintenance or relational smoothness. But when Miriam says, in line 17 above, “I ’m sorry,” she is hardly anticipating the phrase’s adjacency mate, “no problem.” Her usage, instead, is a more polite, if pointed, way of indicating, “I’m sorry that I can in no way make sense of what you just spewed; would you care to run that by me again?” To be fair, there is a secondary usage of “I’m sorry” (I missed your point), sometimes heard as “beg your pardon?”—but I argue that Miriam’s usage is not that but a face-preservation move bespeaking defensiveness, not openness. Here, by way of contrast (since she had, after all, asked the group if anyone there had experience in SOTL), is an alternative “reasonable” response that she might have said, instead of “I ’m sorry,” to Ike’s report of his grant: “Oh, that’s wonderful—tell us all about it!” She is, after all the one who asked. He answers affirmatively, and with a grant no less, and she is “sorry”?

As two points determine a line, and two similar utterances suggest a trend, let us explore a bit further the second telltale instance, seen above, of what could be named “adjacency widow” (a term Pomerantz might appreciate for naming one footloose half of an adjacency pair, roaming the erstwhile streets of Politeness, looking not for its mate but for trouble). To wit, even more revealing of a defensive posture than her “I ’m sorry” is her use, in line 40, of an equally promiscuous “*Thank you.*” From Miriam’s usage of “thank you,” one would scarcely expect Ike to complete the pair with its customary mate, “you’re welcome.” Her “*Thank you*” suggests an ironic *agreement* with Ike, who has,

indeed, just discredited her whole program and university role, unless it restricts itself to promulgating Socratic method.

My analytic goal, here, is to detect signs of relational development, as a possible indicator of the Pragmatic model's Stage 3, that the exchange thereby qualify as dialogue, in the purview of the model. Instead, these two interlocutors are, as is made clear in the analysis above, engaged in a fruitless and almost nonsensical competitive battle of egos, though their moves of effrontery and defensiveness are somewhat cloaked by discursive veils of mock politeness, veils exposed above, through the lens of an expressly dialogic discourse analysis.

Instead of a gesture of cooperation and an invitation to partake in a tension-easing collaboration—in the sense of Locher's (2004) update on politeness theory, which seeks not a competitive edge from a marked bid, almost at ingratiating, but a “politic” (p. 75), if not “polite,” move toward comity, toward relational equilibrium—Miriam's thank-you instead stands as a spurious, thereby inauthentic, response—to a comment, that itself, scarcely bespeaks politeness. Indeed, Ike's “nothing new since Socrates,” not only works to dismantle the credibility of Miriam's program, it more immediately depletes this week's invited presentation of all presumable value, just as Ike's similar, and similarly impolitic, remark did during Week 1, when smacked, with topspin, right into Nora's back court. Tennis, anyone? Not if you're going to play *that* way. Dialogue aborted.

Of Winners and Losers, in the Pragmatics of Dialogue

I note Ike's Week 1 precursor to the selfsame comment, that produced Miriam's spurious tokens of “politeness,” all set in a miasma of non-dialogue, to help set up a key

analytic point, as my study moves toward its close. The above analysis is not, at its core, about Miriam, and it is not about Ike. It is about *discourse* (a given, in settings of teaching and learning) that would (ideally, in terms of the “movement” underway, according to the quoted passage atop Page 1) take the form of *dialogue*. The players are not to be judged, but thanked, for signing consent forms and allowing their words, and in some cases images to appear in this analysis of “what can happen, and in this cases did, when faculty, staff, and student assistants convene in an experimental program of faculty development couched in the context of course (re-)design.

We can swap in an infinite number of players, and prospectively see a similar unfortunate, uncomfortable (including to the onlookers), and—mainly this—*unproductive* display of “talk not going anywhere, fast,” just as happenstance and circumstance might also produce moments of rich human intercourse, as seen in the stalwart performances of both Peg and Nora and as seen in the persistence and group-aided contribution of Julia’s alt-tab breakthrough. As we have seen and heard, Ike wants his researchers trained; I, similarly, want my interlocutors, in settings of teaching and learning, just as well trained. I do not present this analysis to laud one player and castigate another, as it is hardly becoming of a practical theorist to render discursive critique for such a limited value as Person A did it better than Person B. My aim is to look at what happens in talk, to rigorously test a proposed model and, hopefully, identify places for its improvement. I seek not to answer the questions of “who won?” or of “who lost?” I seek to show a way in which all parties, in settings such as the one under investigation in this study, can take away from the event a sense of value, and even, to invoke yet another of Martin Buber’s essential characteristics of genuine dialogue, a

sense of *confirmation* (Cissna & Anderson, 2004), not just of where someone's present value *stands* (that is *affirmation*), but of what someone's value, his or her inherent worth as a human being, as a Thou, could *become*: "a respect for the other that inclines one not to impose but to help the reality and possibility of the other [to] unfold" (p. 196).

I find this an important point to clarify, owing to my own ever-developing philosophy, aided by Levinas, Rogers, and others, that research should not haphazardly (or at all) bring discredit to those allowing for the research to exist (this stance brought out, for the record, since here transcribed, in my interview with Peg). My aim is not to ridicule nor deride, it is to test and, hopefully improve a model that can lead to improved outcomes in settings of teaching and learning. That said, I return to Miriam and Ike, to look for evidence of the model's third stage, productivity.

In the Pragmatics model, Stage 2 anticipates, or makes space for, Stage 3: they follow sequentially. This prospective dialogue in the third and final exemplar studied in this chapter did not lack for the essence of Stage 2, difference engaged and sustained. However, what is not so evident is the substance of Stage 3, productivity: that some worthwhile, perhaps novel, *outcome* be developed, representing the significant *product* of the dialogue, whether conceptual, relational, practical, or any combination of the three. To wit, one can scarcely consider Ike's conceptual point of "nothing new since Socrates," a *novel* outcome of a *dialogic* exchange, since it is a point he has made often during the training seminar, including during the very first training meeting, as seen in the first session excerpt presented in Appendix D (line 63). Ironically, to invoke Socrates, Ike does not require dialogue; he came in with that line. We might look, instead then, in seeking to identify a *conceptual* product of the dialogue, in the context of this training

setting, to the point Ike is able to bring out regarding the importance of follow-up testing of pedagogical trainees (such as are the participants in this seminar!). That, however, is a point I am inferring, not a point the Ike is really pressing nor one likely to have impacted the other participants. He didn't really say it, nor was it heard. And there arises another valuable finding, analytically, to draw from this exchange, which is otherwise barren of the fruit needed to qualify as Stage 3, even for the lowest level, cool. If to be considered dialogic at all, the Stage 3 conceptual product must be picked up and acknowledged, whether by talk or as evidenced in follow-up activity, by the interlocutors, not merely available, through many listenings, to an analyst. The conceptual development has to matter, then and there, in the chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981) of the participants' symbolic interaction.

The third proposed possibility, as Regards Stage-3 dialogic productivity, is that of the third type: *relational*. Would we say that Ike and Miriam are coming to a new stage of their relational development—one produced through dialogue—and so we would attribute to the two of them, a co-authorship for their identities as socially constructed in this moment? Michel Foucault (cf. 1978/1994, 1982/1994, 1982/1994a) is well cited for his fundamental ideas of identity as constructed in discourse; here I am specifying a dialogic discourse as the co-maker of identity, and in doing so proposing one possible answer to the question, “But *how* is reality socially constructed?”

I raise this prospect for relational development as a possibility, but to determine its materiality—its validity, as Ike might say—will require an examination of further interaction. From this point, analyzed above, of contestation, perhaps we will see a productive development occur in the relational identity between Miriam and Ike. He has

bound her up into almost-nonsensical utterances of sorry and thank you. Perhaps there's something to be gained, relationally, in the way that a very rigorous tennis match, or any contest, sometimes produces, through its very competition, a stronger bond between the combatants. I now present the final training session excerpt to be examined in this study, to help answer that question. The following exchange (from Training Session, Excerpt 10 in Appendix D) occurred about 25 minutes past the time of the conflict just examined.

- 43 Miriam . . . I- Abner has been there- I think Mark
44 has been there- Eve Bollig and Chloe (Julia
45 clears throat) are both uh- mentors and/or
46 coaches
- 47 Julia But all of those people do not know
48 education
- 49 Miriam No- they don't
50 (several voices escalating and overlapping,
51 some heard to be repeating "That's the
52 problem")
- 53 Ike That's a real issue, because all of a
54 sudden, people self-identify themselves and
55 they haven't- been trained
- 56 Miriam Okay (upbeat tone) here's *one* piece of good
57 news. The funders insisted that we- assess-
58 formatively and summatively at- at the end
59 of our three year commitment- uh- what's
60 going on in this collaborative
- 61 Ike Good. How much money did they give you to do
62 the assessment?
- 63 Miriam NOTHING
- 64 Ike Well then they don't *mean* it.
- 65 Miriam Yes they DO mean it
66 (a soft chuckle heard, as the conflict
67 escalates)
- 68 Ike No they DON'T mean it

69 Miriam Yes they DO
70 Ike 'Cuz if they wanted you to *do* it they'd give
71 you resources to *do* it.
72 Miriam I'm not coming out at the end of this [Ike
73 guffaws: Ha ha ha ha ha ha ha] three years
74 from now and have ANYbody say to me "Wh-
75 what did you learn Miriam?" and not have a
76 formal assessment available, cuz I'm gonna
77 say, "here it is"
78 (skip about 90 seconds)
79 Miriam I have *heard*, Julia and Ike, what you're
80 saying [Ike laughs softly] and I find more
81 comfort in talking with you than- than not.
82 (pause) Okay- the- the- the- three- um
83 (pause) characteristics of- uh SOTL-
84 research- oh- I- I named all of them (pause)
85 so- so (pause) let me (pause) let me talk
86 just briefly then- Julia, in response to one
87 of your questions about what this means to
88 some of the faculty members in the
89 collaborative (pause). . .

A perusal of the above exchange, particularly lines 69-75, dismisses the notion that in the competition Ike and Miriam have, though the repart  , became fast friends, In fact, lines 64-69 are reminiscent of the famous Monty Python pseudo-argument, except that the customer in that well-watched TV bit was not seeking a dialogue, but an argument. If "yes they do / no they don't / yes, they do" is not an even argument, then it is surely neither dialogue. Sometimes combatants do *not* leave a testy contest as better collaborators.

Let's back up. Miriam had begun the exchange by dropping names of professors around campus who are aligned with her work, but Julia, caught up in the spirit of debate, points out that these professors are not pedagogy experts. When Ike, in lines 53-55, uses the opportunity to again question, implicitly, the validity of Miriam's project, since it is

populated by personnel not specially *trained*, simply self-proclaimed experts who have volunteered, Miriam seizes the opportunity (lines 56-57) to make a conciliatory gesture, which she labels “*one piece of good news*” (and for her, it might be, if it goes over with this salty group). Her funders are requiring her—and this *should* placate Ike—to do an assessment of her program. This simply leads to the “yes they do / no they don’t / yes, they do” squabble, after Ike points out that this requested assessment has not received its own funding. Ike guffaws his way through her explanation that she will be prepared when and if asked about her outcomes. We are surely in the second stage of dialogue, if the requirement for that stage is the maintenance of the engagement of difference. I am moved however, as analyst, to call the dialogue aborted, at the point where Ike is mocking the words of his erstwhile partner in dialogue.

Perhaps the dialogue changes partners when multiple parties are in play, as is available in a setting of teaching and learning. This is an interesting prospect for the discourse analyst. If parties A and B flame out during the heat of “difference, engaged,” might it be possible that parties C and D pick up the thread, riding into further progress the work of their predecessors. It is something to be hoped for, but it is not the product in this case. There is, in the transcript, a third player, and that is Julia, whom I could call Party C, and whom Miriam addresses in line 86, as she works to move past a contested and unpleasant moment, as evidenced in lines 81-86 where Miriam has a distressingly hard time recalling, to review them, the three main points of her presentation.

Miriam began her presentation calling for a dialogue. I questioned, as I began my analysis, whether this move would somehow produce some kind of special dialogue or perhaps reveal itself, in subsequent discursive interaction, as more a gesture of perhaps

defensiveness. I'm not sure I would label, nor need I, what happened above in psychological terms, but I am prepared to conclude that this was not, by the terms of my pragmatic model, "a dialogue" as things worked out, though it did produce some particularly heated moments for the demonstration of the warm and hot levels possible when difference is engaged.

In the made-for-textbook world of pedagogical discourse, it is easy to conceive, script, and present a dialogue that runs smoothly and productively. However, in the discourse-analysis-research-world of classroom dialogue—and snippets from that world has been surveyed in this dissertation—things unfold a bit messier, if yet acceptably, given the K-12 arena in which this research is usually conducted: the outcomes are acceptable, to the teacher at least, who wields control, informed by such texts as Manke's (1997) *Classroom Power Relations*. However, as we saw play out—with unexpectedly unpleasant results for Miriam—when we look at adults, including those of high societal and organizational status such as university professors, go at it head to head, the dialogic outcomes are less predictable, not always welcomed, and, verily, non-dialogic, in the end.

Concluding Thoughts Regarding Dialogic Discourse Analysis, of Interaction

Within the much-critiqued (as too simplistic and close-ended) model of classroom dialogue discussed in this study's review of the literature as initiation-response-evaluation/feedback (IRE/F), the "serve" offered up by the teacher to be returned by a learner would likely appear in the form of an overt invitation for student response, such as "Does anyone have an example of this?" Therefore, almost by definition, any student response to such an invitation is likely one of compliance (not contradiction nor

challenge, nor essentially of authenticity), that is, compliance with the direction the teacher is wanting the discussion to go.

This striving for compliance is a trend noted forcefully by Ellsworth (1997), earlier cited in this work as thoughtful, if rigorous, critic of Burbules's (1993) book-length treatment regarding dialogue and teaching. In a chapter provocatively titled "Communicative Dialogue: Control Through Continuity," Ellsworth explains that Burbules's perspective on educational dialogue in theory and practice "lacks a theorization of the limits of continuity. It lacks a theorization of discontinuity" (p. 102). Without a theorization of discontinuity, Ellsworth explains, "The only way we can read someone's unwillingness to stay in dialogue is that they have not sufficiently developed the moral virtues necessary to keep their minds 'open' their emotions in check" (p. 102).

According to Ellsworth, this doesn't necessarily mean that the person who answers has to agree with the caller's message, but it does mean that what she considers a "communicative dialogue," as discussed (though not by that name, which is of her making) across educational literature, is working when an answer to the question, Do you understand? is a reflexive and expected answer. As she critiques the shallowness of dialogue with pre-planned outcomes, and even processes, the *appropriate* classroom answer to "Do you understand" is "Yes I have stood under. I have taken your perspective upon myself. I can reflect to you now in a way that you will recognize and expect—no surprises" (p. 92).

I present this critique to demonstrate that perhaps Ellsworth, writing as an outsider to communication studies, as she states in her preface, might find a better term for the kind of dialogue in which to understand is to *stand under* and to break from

continuity is to reveal a lack of the moral virtue essential to dialogue. I do not doubt that these shallow understandings exist; I just don't believe that they can well be characterized as "communicative" understandings, unless the critic is riding in a conceptual vehicle dating to the days of the transmission model of communication, which decades of scholarship has worked to upgrade, as has been discussed at length in this study.

Dialogue has now been examined, in this chapter, not *as* situation but *within* a situation, as interactive performance. We have seen highs and lows, hots and cools, across the three stages. Furthermore, we have seen problems arise in the naming of the very first dialogic move; that is, we have seen that Stage 1 is the most arguable. Who started it? That is a matter of interpretation, yet, again, the new idea of degree, not here or not, helps us to nominate worthy contenders, not argue absolutes, and that is in some ways, the most pragmatic finding of this whole report: the onset of dialogue can, arguably, be found anywhere the analyst has sharp enough vision to find it.

CHAPTER 7:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Through the foregoing analysis of a rich corpus of data that I am exceedingly privileged and eminently grateful to have been allowed to capture and study, I have developed and supported three principle points—these aimed to inform practice, owing to my meta-theoretical foundation of practical theory—as regards dialogue in teaching and learning, particularly in my research setting of faculty development, as follow.

Summary of Analysis: Situation Level

First, I have argued for the very salience of a “situation-level” analysis as a necessary platform for dialogic discourse analysis. This prospective Phase 1 was not exactly sitting there on the table, as I commenced to analyze my data. In fact, I have spent more than three years devotedly trying—notoriously with only marginal success for most of this time—various approaches to analyzing my data in a way that is expressly *dialogic*, since no such methodology yet exists, as such, save for the Pragmatics model modestly proposed in 2007.

Meanwhile, I taught and taught and taught, theorizing, testing out, expanding upon, rejecting, revising, and proposing to extraordinary collaborators and critics, some who are world famous and some, I expect who, may well become so. Thanks to such an incredible array of collaborative support, I have come up with this twin-perspective that, I hope, is at least seen as tenable, as a decent starting point for the scholarly program I have set for myself. I appreciate that there is no way to “prove” the salience of the

situational perspective as necessary to the interactional, and that status fits well into my metatheoretical stance, which seeks not to prove causal relations but to inform practice in terms that would, or at least could, make sense and be valued by those whose discourse, whose talk, is studied toward informing techniques of managing—as a productive starting point and durable interpretive foothold—the dilemmas, difficulties, challenges and contradictions of everyday life, as practiced in everyday talk.

Under the thusly-unprovable, but hopefully useful, proposition that the interactional analysis of prospective dialogue should rest upon this situation-level analysis, I duly strived to tease out, from a blend of interviewing data and recorded interactional data, the principle dilemmas inherent in the interwoven set of practices I hope to inform, these of dialogic interaction in teaching and learning, in general, and of faulty training, in particular.

Toward that work, I first showed, toward validating my research site as generalizable to my larger scope, that traditional learning settings (i.e., classrooms)—about which there *is* a rich literature, and some research, available for review—make for a poor environment in which to derive an “anatomy of dialogue in teaching and learning,” since these traditional settings are encumbered by a power-full and prevalent dilemma, unsolvable at present: all discourse in such settings underlies a performance oriented to, or at least toward, teacher approval, that is, toward the maximizing of the student’s main concrete and compelling goal for the event, a “good grade” awarded.

Any faculty member who has, as I many times have, exchanged cheery and warm good-byes on the last day of class, then to find in the course evaluations a strongly disapproving critique from those who went out the door bubbling with the warmest

gestures of gratitude knows what I mean, as does, conversely, any student heading out the door, beaming with pride and receiving a hearty handshake, maybe a hug, from the teacher, only to be shocked and dismayed at later discovering his or her grade. If there is a place teeming, therefrom, with inauthenticity, it is the graded classroom (typically), so therein is not the best place to look for the precursors, elements, substance, and outcomes—toward proposing an anatomical sketch—of *authentic dialogue* in teaching and learning. Rather, a special site is needed, one devoid of this prevalent dilemma (if yet producing dilemmas of its own), and such is precisely where I have gained grateful access: with “students” of equal or higher institutional status as the “teachers,” and no grades, nor formal class evaluations, of permanent record to systematically distort the discourse.

That apparent methodological rift—namely, why study faculty training when one’s interests and segments of the literature review include so much from other arenas, including K-12?—thusly argued as, indeed, a methodological advantage, I proceeded to perform my situation-level analysis and argue for one prevalent, pervasive dilemma there, and a couple subsidiary ones, too.

This pervasive dilemma I showed, contrasting training-room interaction with insights from interviewing data, emerged as this: college faculty (unlike teachers at K-12, who must be examined and licensed) are presumed to be competent, at least, and expert, at best, as teachers, though it is well known that—especially at the setting of my data, the large, public research institution—faculty are hired, and compensated, for their scholarly merit more so than their teaching prowess; furthermore, their promotion and tenure reviews will be skewed heavily in terms of scholarly productivity, not their teaching, so it

is their scholarly skill set that naturally gets the most rigorous development. Yet they are paid to also teach classes, though neither specifically trained in pedagogy nor oriented experientially toward the development of excellence there. Competence will suffice, if the scholarly record is robust. But teaching is an intensely personal endeavor, one that, I assert, all teachers (or most) desire to perform with excellence. The pervasive dilemma, then, arises when they—veteran faculty, especially—walk into the training room to be “taught to teach.” Isn’t that what they’ve been doing 10, 15, 20, or maybe 30 years, and paid well, for it, too?” Authenticity in dialogue (e.g. “that is really hard for me, too, and I hate it when I fail to understand how to reach my students”) is about as scarce there, as it is in the classroom where a student is thinking, but not saying until the class evaluation, “This class sucked.”

In practical theory, dilemmas are teased out of discursive data, which are then analyzed further for evidence of their solutions, respecting values, some say ideal, that are also evident in the discourse, such that the solutions (or techniques for managing the dilemmas, if not solving them) are couched in terms and values relevant to the population studied. In this case, the key to managing this dilemma, as available in the discursive data studied, is to orient the training not to general principles of pedagogy (derided by the study’s trainees as “eduactionese”), principles which, in a sense, should already be well understood by well-esteemed and paid professors, but to, instead, orient the training focus to something well valued and understandably not yet mastered, particularly newer technology (or, it was inferred, if not present in the data, something like new course curriculum, maybe even, say, “the new textbook”).

Summary of Analysis: Interaction Level

Above are the major finding at the situational level, where dilemmas arise in a pervasive, not individual sense, and are, hence, most compelling for analysis. As for the second analytic thrust of this study, that at the interactional level, the returns are less firm, in my view, though perhaps even more badly lacking in pedagogical literature, my review of which may stand as equally—or more—significant as are my analytic findings.

I maintain that it is an expressly a “communication”-based perspective that is lacking in educational literature on dialogue. That is, for all the proliferation of interest, scholarly and vernacular, in *dialogue* (with its many definitions), including the well-emphasized (in Chapter 1) “movement” promulgating dialogue in learning contexts, scarce is any close, discursive analysis that breaks down the anatomy, into meaningful parts, of “dialogue (*per se*) in teaching and learning”—in process and production. Indeed, the very term *dialogue* has been nowhere to be found in such prospectively rich sources I have located and reviewed as *Discourse Analysis and the Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events: A Microethnographic Perspective* (Bloom, et al., 2005), *Classroom Power Relations: Understanding Student-Teacher Interaction* (Manke, 1997), or even *Approaches to Studying Classroom Discourse* (Walsh, 2006), to name three well cited language-in-learning sources in which one might expect to find the term *dialogue* playing a central role—or at least *some* role.

And not at all available in present communication scholarship is close, discursive analysis employed to theorize, normatively, how dialogue *could* and, even *should* be understood and practiced toward helping members of learning communities to better

reach their various goals, manage situational tensions and role ambiguities, and find heightened satisfaction and benefit in the process, both individually and in terms of the larger learning community and beyond.

Therefore I have, with great help, presented and tested—at least as a step in the right direction—the Pragmatics of Dialogue model first proposed (Craig & Zizzi, 2007) in the earliest phases of this dissertation research and writing and later amended in subsequent treatment (Zizzi, 2008a, 2008b), to investigate how the model’s three proposed stages would bear out under detailed and prolonged analysis, as has been ongoing for some four years, now, since its inception.

Alas, the model was, under scrutiny, seen to break down—or, as I wrote, to “leak”—when seeking to point, definitively, to openings and closings in discursive interaction, and I expect that Mikhail Bakhtin, were he alive to comment, would say, “I told you so” (except in Russian and maybe under an assumed name). It is the interconnectedness of utterances, not the availability to separate them out as starts and finishes, that distinguishes dialogic understandings of discourse. Some moments of analysis did better than others in this regard, but more than the slightest “leakage” (as I called it) impairs the model’s integrity, and I admit to more than just a slight amount of this leakage. The model works better to show when a rally is “getting good” and, maybe, “making a new point” than it works to isolate serves and point winners.

In tennis, my much-referenced metaphor for dialogue, it is clear who is serving and who returning, at the outset of play, anyway. In discourse, it is harder to pin down, especially, the serve. “Advantage, Mr. Bakhtin.” Meanwhile, I hold that the model’s utility in Stages 2 and 3 did retain merit, though analytic investigation. Once the ball is in

play, there is no more a server and returner to identify, just players, and, as the point—however long maintained—comes to its naturally bounded conclusion, the continuance of the match (and beyond that the tournament, season, epoch, and more), notwithstanding, players, as well as analysts, may make apt, if arguable, determinations as to that point's aesthetic and material value: its productivity, be this conceptual, relational, or practical.

For example and most richly, on all three counts, at the close of the Week 6 session, “Julia’s alt-tab breakthrough,” required a dialogic (and interesting, unstructured) collaboration to clearly conceptualize the problem experienced by Dom and Peg and also to then produce a remarkably elegant and satisfactory solution in practice. Yet, perhaps the richest benefit of that productive dialogue arises in the pride Julia derived from her central role in the breakthrough—in the identity work performed through and by the dialogue, identity work that cannot help but to play out, relationally, after that. Are there more bases for this judgment of productivity than the three bases I propose and have examined? Perhaps so.

Practical Application

As an analyst now informed by roughly four years of classroom and related experimentation with this model, I offer that, for practical purposes, the most useful product of this study is *not* so much in the identification of a “Stage 1” of a prospective event of dialogue—specifically of dialogue in settings of teaching and learning. As I will reinforce below, in Limitations, the precise identification of “the onset of dialogue” is fraught with problems. As every parent who has driven with children on a long trip knows, and therefore maybe I should have seen it coming, being that parent, in spades,

there will never be a resolution to the debate over “who started it.” But even if the identification of dialogue’s *starting point* eludes firm identification, I have succeeded in pointing out that Stage 2, the sustained engagement of difference, can be readily detected, and, I propose, not just in analysis but also in practice.

That is, I believe that the single most important contribution of this study lies in the confirmation of the Pragmatics model’s proposition of “dialogue in teaching and learning” as not just the once-in-a-great-while event, almost by chance, if yet needing fertile conditions to be established and maintained that is central to the moments of meeting conceptualization much discussed and supported in this work. Instead, I propose that the teacher—or the learner or, in the Vygotskian sense, the teacher-learner—would do well to attend to the discursive clues and cues that might indicate, if not the “start” of dialogue, then at least the processual development of Stage 2, that, somehow or other, difference has not just been demonstrated but is being sustained. The dialogic moment—and, indeed, my study supports that the highest *peaks* of dialogue are few, fleeting, and extraordinarily productive—can occur more readily if the dialogic process of Stage 2 is recognized and nurtured, *in situ*. My proposition of “levels”—cool, warm, and hot—is but a tentative, maybe useful, enhancement for understanding dialogue, as I have said earlier, as not just the “climax” (the special and rare moment) but the “romance” the process that can produce such a special moment,

Also of high practical value, I believe, is the analytic point that arose in both examples of dialogic moments (and was eschewed in the cases where dialogue failed to sustain, once begun). I refer to the critical factor of facework, which serves as a lifeline during those precious moments where difference does make it into the interactional level.

Whether this facework is understood in terms of politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) or in its updated cataloging in terms of not *polite* but of *politic* communication, as Locher (2004) presents, at those moments when difference borders on disagreement, I do not think enough attention can be paid to the assurance that no party suffers a loss of status or prestige for having dared to say, in class, “I don’t see it that way.”

Further, as seen in Peg’s Protest, Part 2 (after the session adjournment), it is frighteningly easy for the person controlling the floor (or the curriculum) to imagine, once a protest has been made and seemingly addressed, that it is “resolved.” Seldom, I argue, is there ever a true “ending” to dialogue, even as I also argue, that, for practical purposes, there can be places to notice, “Hey that worked out; that produced something we needed, comfortably or not.” More likely, the raising of difference—scarce as it is in settings of teaching and learning, especially where grades and performance evaluations are formalized, even permanent—will not be nurtured into dialogue, but “dealt with” by the one in ostensive control and presumed (falsely) to be “done with.”

Study Limitations and Directions for Future Research

I believe that the chief limitation of this study—which necessarily points to directions for future research—lies in the small number of participants, especially faculty participants, whose discourse and related interaction then became available for study. The three faculty participants, Ike, Peg, and Dom, indeed presented very different persona and interactional styles, but I can scarcely call the range of these styles broad enough to represent all that might be observed with a group of, say 12-15 trainees. On the other hand, prolonged (semester-length) faculty training is next to nonexistent, given the time

commitment involved and the “pervasive dilemma” revealed in the study. A one-day workshop—or even half-day—is closer to the norm that I have personally seen available, across some 23 years of university-level instruction. In fact, as mentioned in Chapter 4, this program was replicated the very next year, and I participated and videorecorded the whole semester, but for the second year, only one faculty member could be recruited to extend such a hearty portion of her semester planner. I acknowledge, then, the limitation, but also note the somewhat-mitigation of having a full 12 weeks to study my participants.

Another significant limitation of this study centers upon method, namely the lack of any existing and well tested and validated method for the study of dialogue, expressly, in teaching and learning. I very loosely coin and propose the term “dialogic discourse analysis,” especially with the leakage shown in the Pragmatics model when tested “under pressure.” For now, I rather consider the first of the three terms simply an adjective modifying the next two words in this still-developing methodology. I did my best to use this methodology fruitfully, but I cannot present my findings—especially at the interactional level—as definitive, when the model itself broke down, in some important ways, in use. I believe further study toward legitimizing a form of discourse analysis that is expressly dialogic is sorely needed, if we are to better understand this ideal of discursive intercourse, in settings of teaching and learning or elsewhere.

Lastly, I am still unsatisfied that my data revealed, save for Peg’s Protest, an adequate basis for richly revealing what I am after, which is a basis for better understanding the discursive basis for “*difference*, engaged.” To explain this shortcoming, I return to my tennis metaphor. Imagine, indeed, a setting for teaching and learning, be it a training facility or more traditional classroom, wherein utterances are,

metaphorically, tennis balls smacked this way or that. One might imagine a lot of balls served up by the trainer or teacher, some of them flying past the students and some being caught and hung on to. Relatively few would be returned, by way of direct, verbal response back to the teacher/trainer, and not many of these responses would reflect any significant challenge to what the teacher had served up, when asking for a response.

Hence, it would not be appropriate to label an asked-for response as necessarily a “return of serve,” since this metaphorical action intends to characterize, in the name of communication-theory sensitivities toward the idea of dialogue, a “demonstration of difference.” Perhaps that explains why the most fruitful (in my view, as supported in interviewing data) example of dialogue, the above-referenced alt-tab breakthrough, occurred during an amorphous discussion period following the formal training. It was too late for a new topic but too early to leave—and look what happened: *dialogue*! Further research is needed to help develop and refine a method and/or identify a fertile site in which discourse analysts can study dialogue in teaching and learning, with the communicational focus on *difference, welcomed, nurtured, and engaged*.

Concluding Thoughts

The ultimate aim of the work I hope to have advanced through this dissertation is, ultimately, to help create in classrooms at all grade levels, from kindergarten onward, a space, and in that space, a practice—*techné*—for the kind of dialogue that communication theorists (and others, such as Paolo Freire and Martin Buber) have propounded, one where no party is institutionally compelled to silence in the face of authority, not likely to be told—literally nor figuratively—to “sit back down.” My unique “classroom,” given its constituent members and other special circumstances, would seem

almost tailor-made for this purpose, and I hope to have demonstrated a modicum of the analysis needed, for moving this movement forward.

In fact, I must admit to a sort of contrarian affinity for Manke's (1997) aforementioned rascal, Erin, who (as detailed in Chapter 3, toward validation of my research setting) pointed out her teacher's sloppy pencil work. Maybe Erin will someday grow up to become, herself, a tenured faculty member—like our own Peg—at which time Erin's critical observation, her "demonstration of difference," will not be so easily dismissed, as it was by Ms. Kaminski: "That's the kind of 2 that came out, so that's how it will have to be."

I close this study with a return to the ideas of *difference* brought together in Chapter 1, under the subheading *Different from What?*, wherein the synthesis of perspectives cited there culminates in the idea of humanity—and with it all of language, and with *that* all of reality—as an infinite array of centers, all in motion. Appreciating metaphor, but tiring of tennis, I propose to conclude this work by likening this array of "possibilities in motion" to the vast array of stars in the cosmos.

For, while all stars are in motion—and, for Deleuze (1994), the celebration of movement, not of stability, should be the aim of philosophy, at least, of a philosophy of difference, as "movement, for its part, implies a plurality of centres, a superimposition of perspectives, a tangle of points of view, a coexistence of moments which essentially distort representation (p.56)—no single star (if we suspend the assumed directionality of the Big Bang) can be located "ahead of" or "behind" another; no star is the "opposite" of another, and no star is exclusively confined, in its identity, as belonging to only one group (consider our own sun: in one frame, the center of our galaxy, in another, but a

drop in the Milky Way). They are all just stars—the same, in that they are all *stars*, yet different in that each is its *own* star. So it goes, I propose, with human beings, with identities, with perspectives, with nations, ethnicities, speech communities, sexes, genders, institutions, words and meanings themselves, and, for present purposes, participants in endeavours of teaching and learning.

We are all stars (all-stars?), coexisting, all in relation to each other and with, as our highest goal, the celebration of a multitude of centers, not a *resolution* of difference. The profound inescapability of difference, ingrained in language itself, cannot be underestimated, as it shapes all meaning far below the surface of human interaction, yet processes of social construction and also those of power imbalance can obscure difference—by homogenizing the talk—if we are not informed, mindful, and purposeful, in our practices as interlocutors, as talkers, together, as human beings at once teaching and learning, especially when, as we perform our identities in talk, we encounter the possibility for *dialogue*.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, N. (2005). Developing 21st century teaching and learning: Dialogic literacy. *New Horizons for Learning* [online journal]. Available at <http://www.newhorizons.org>
- Alexander, R. J. (2001). *Culture and Pedagogy: International Comparisons in Primary Education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Alexander, R.J. (2006). *Towards dialogic thinking: Rethinking classroom talk*. York: Dialogos.
- Alexander, R. J. (2005). Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy. Keynote Address, International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology, 10th International Conference, University of Durham, UK, July, 2005.
- Ames, C. K., & Gahagan, H. S. (1995). Self-reflection: Supporting students in taking ownership of evaluation. In C. Dudley-Marling and D. Searle (Eds.), *Who owns learning? Questions of autonomy, choice, and control* (pp. 52-66). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Anderson, R. (n.d.) On dialogue and its difficulties. Centre for Dialogue, Simon Fraser University. Retrieved October 27, 2008
<http://www.sfu.ca/dialogue/publications/ondialogue.htm>.
- Anderson, R. (2007). Dialogue: A good conversation. *SGI Quarterly*, 5, 1-8.
- Anderson, R., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N. (2004). Texts and contexts of dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Arnett, R. C. (1982). Rogers and Buber: Similarities yet fundamental differences. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 358-372.
- Arnett, R. C. (1986). *Communication and community*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Arnett, R. C. (1992). *Dialogic education: Conversation about the ideas and between persons*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Arnett, R. C., & Arnesson, P. A. (1999). *Dialogic civility in a cynical age: Community, hope, and interpersonal relationships*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ashworth, J. (2008). Foreword. In J. Vella, *On Teaching and Learning* (pp. xi-xiii). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984a). *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolski, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984b). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Eds.; V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bales, R. F. (1949). *Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Barzun, J. (1954). *Teacher in America*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday (Original work published in 1945)
- Barzun, J. (1968). *The American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
(Original work published in 1968)
- Baxter, L. A. (2004). Dialogues of relating. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication study* (pp. 107-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Baxter, L. A., & Montgomery, B. W. (1996). *Relating: Dialogue and dialectics*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Berry, A. (2007). *Tensions in teaching about teaching: Understanding practice as a teacher educator*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Black, L. W. (2005). Building connection while thinking together: By-products of employee training in dialogue. *Western Journal of Communication*, 69, 273-292.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shurt-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language & and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bosacki, S. L. (2005). *The culture of classroom silence*. New York: Peter Lang
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brockriede, W. (1976). Arguers as lovers. In D. K. Darnell & W. Brockriede, *Persons communicating* (pp. 153-162). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Universals in language usage, politeness phenomena*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Buber, M. (1955). *Between man and man* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou* (2nd ed.; R. G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Scribner.
- Buburles, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Burke, K. (1945/1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1950/1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1961). *The Rhetoric of religion: Studies in logology*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.
- Carbaugh, D. (2005). Position paper for the plenary session on dialogue and cross-cultural perspective. Paper presented at the annual conference of international communication Association, New York, NY.
- Carey, J. W. (1989). A cultural approach to communication. *Communication*, 2, 1-22.
- Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. (First edition, also cited, published 1988)

- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (1990). The contribution of Carl R. Rogers to a philosophic practice of dialogue. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 48, 125-147.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (1998). Theorizing about dialogic moments: The Buber-Rogers position and postmodern themes. *Communication Theory*, 8, 63-104.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (2002). *Moments of Meeting: Buber, Rogers and the potential for public dialogue*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (2004). Public dialogue and intellectual history. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 193-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clarke, A. E. (2003). Situational analyses: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26, 553-576.
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1999). Learning to teach for social justice. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers* (pp. 114-144). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, K. M., & J. Zuengler, J. (2008). *The research process and classroom discourse analysis: Current perspectives*. New York: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Cooper, P. J., & Simonds, C. (1999). *Communication for the classroom teacher*. Boston: Ally and Bacon.
- Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of sociological thought: Ideas in historical and social context*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.

- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9, 199-161.
- Craig, R. T. (2006). Communication as a practice. In G. J. Shepherd, J. St. John & T. Striphas (Eds.), *Communication as ...: Perspectives on theory* (pp. 38-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Craig, R. T. (2007). Arguments about “dialogue” in practice and theory. In F. H. Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, & A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
- Craig, R. T., & Sanusi, A. L. (2000). 'I'm just saying . . .': Discourse Markers of standpoint continuity. *Argumentation*, 14, 425-445.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (1995). Grounded practical theory: The case of intellectual discussion. *Communication Theory*, 5, 248-272.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2003). The "issue" in argumentation theory and practice. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard & A. F. S. Henkemans (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation* (pp. 213-218). Amsterdam: SicSat.
- Craig, R. T., & Tracy, K. (2005). "The issue" in argumentation practice and theory. In F. H. v. Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The practice of argumentation* (pp. 11-28). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Craig, R. T., & Zizzi, M. P. (2007). Toward a normative pragmatic model of dialogue.

- Социокультурные проблемы языка и коммуникации [*Sociocultural Problems in Language and Communication*], 4, 152-159.
- Cranton, P. (1996). *Professional development as transformational learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cummins, J. (2003). Challenging the construction of difference as deficit: Where are identity, intellect, imagination, and power in the new regime of truth? In P. P. Triphonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference* (pp. 41-60). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Curran, M. E. (2008). Narratives of relevance: Seizing (or not) critical moments. In K. M. Cole & J. Zuengler (Eds.), *The research process and classroom discourse analysis: Current perspectives* (pp. 73-76). New York: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Currie, M. (2004). *Difference: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.
- Czubaroff, J., & Friedman, M. (2000). A conversation with Maurice Friedman. *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 243-254.
- Deetz, S. (1990). Reclaiming the subject matter as a guide to mutual understanding: Effectiveness and ethics in interpersonal interaction. *Communication Quarterly*, 38, 226-243.
- Deetz, S. A., & Simpson, J. (2004). Critical organizational dialogue: Open formation and the demand of "otherness." In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 141-158). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Desanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1990). Understanding the use of group decision support systems: The theory of adaptive structuration. In C. S. Fulk (Ed., *Organizations and Communication Technology* (pp. 173-193). Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition* (P. Paton, Trans.). London: Athlone Press. (Original work published in 1977)
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press. (Original work published in 1916)
- Dobransky D., & Frymier, A. B. (2004). Developing teacher-student relationships through out-of-class communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 52, 211-223.
- Dudley-Marling, C., & Searle, D. (Eds.). (1995). Understanding ownership in classroom interaction. In C. Dudley-Marling and D. Searle (Eds.), *Who owns learning? Questions of autonomy, choice, and control* (pp. 16-28). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Duffy, T. M. (2009). Building lines of communication and a research agenda. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 351-367). London: Routledge.
- Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. (Eds.). (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of education: A conversation*. Englewood, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edwards, J. A. (2001). The transcription of discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 321-348). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Ellinor, L., & Gerard, G. (1999). *Dialogue: Rediscover the transforming power of conversation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2006). Global capitalism and critical awareness of language. In A. Jaworski, & N. Coupland (Eds.). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.; pp. 146-157). London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1999)
- Foucault, M. (1978/1994). Governmentality. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault*, pp. 229-245. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972-1977)*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1982/1994). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault*, pp. 300-318. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982/1994a). The subject and power. In P. Rabinow, & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault*, pp. 126-144. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984/1994). The ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault*, pp. 25-42. New York: The New Press.
- Freire, P. (1987). Liberating methods reveal dominant ideology. In I. Shor, & P. Freire (Eds.), *A pedagogy for liberation* (pp. 38-47). New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the city*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (Original work published in 1970.)
- Friedman, M. (1960). *Martin Buber: The life of dialogue*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2000) *A Transactional perspective on teaching and learning: A framework for adult and higher education*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Gerstein, D. R. (1987). To unpack micro and macro: Link small with large and part to whole. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The macro-micro link* (pp. 86-111). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gredler, M. E., & Shields, C. C. (2008). *Vygotsky's legacy*. New York: Guilford.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2002). What is Interpretive ethnography? In R. Clair (Ed.), *Expressions of ethnography: Novel approaches to qualitative methods* (pp. 55-63). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr., & Kellett, P. M. (2004). Dialectical tensions and dialogic moments as pathways to peak experiences. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 159-174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gourlay, L. (2005). OK who's got number one? Permeable Triadic Dialogue, covert participation and the co-construction of checking episodes. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 403-422.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics, 3: Speech acts* (41-58). New York: Academic Press.

- Green, J. L., & Wallat, C., (Eds.) (1981). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1981). Conversational inference and classroom learning. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat, Eds.) *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 3-24). Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1986). *Discourse strategies*. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Gutierrez, K. D. (1993). How talk, context, and script shape contexts for learning: A cross-case comparison of journal sharing. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 335-365.
- Hawes, L. C. (2004). Double binds and structures in dominance and of feelings: Problematics of dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 175-190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heath, R. L.; Pearce, W. B., Shotter, J., Taylor, J. R., Kersten, A., Zorn, T., Roper, J., Motion, J., & Deetz, S. (2006). The process of dialogue: Participation and legitimation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 341-375.
- Hellermann, J. (2008). The contextualization of participation in the asthma project: Response sequences in classroom talk. In K. Cole, & J. Zuengler (Eds.), *The research process in classroom discourse analysis: Current perspectives* (pp. 49-72). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Henning, J. E. (2008). *The art of discussion based teaching: Opening up conversation in the classroom*. New York: Routledge.

- Herman, P., & Gomez, L. M. (2009). Painting guided learning to school: Reconciling the cognitive, motivational, and social contexts of instruction. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 34-61). London: Routledge.
- Hill, P. J. (1986). *Teaching, learning and communication*. London: Croom Helm
- Holt, R. (2003). Bakhtin's dimensions of language and the analysis of conversation. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 225-246.
- Hyde, B., & Bineham, J. L. (2000). From debate to dialogue: Toward a pedagogy of nonpolarized public discourse. *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 208-223.
- King, K. P., & Lawler, P. A. (2003). Trends and issues in the professional development of teachers of adults. In K. P. King and P. A. Lawler (Eds.), *New perspectives in designing and implementing professional development of teachers of adults.* (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Klahr, D. (2009). "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heavens": What about direct instruction? In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 291-310). London: Routledge.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2006). Dewey's reconstruction of the curriculum: From occupations to disciplined knowledge. In D. T. Hanson (Ed.), *John Dewey and our educational prospect* (pp. 113-128). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1990). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (4th ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing.

- Kolb, D. A. (1984) *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lawler, P. A., & King, K. P. (2000). *Planning for a fact of faculty development: Using adult learning strategies*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Lemke, J.L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Levinas, E. (1985). *Ethics and infinity* (R. A. Cohen, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquense University Press.
- Lezotte, L. W., & Block, P. (1994). The empowered school: A case for authentic restructuring. *People & Education*, 2, 382-393.
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Linell, P. (1998) *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction, and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and politeness and action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Loughran, J. J. (2006). *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Mahoney, D. (2008). *Ethics in the classroom: Bridging the gap between theory and practice*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Manke, M. P. (1997). *Classroom Power Relations: Understanding student-teacher interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Mayo, P. (1999). *Gramsci, Freire, and adult education: Possibilities for transformational action*. London: Zed Books.
- McCaw, S. R. (2008) *Implications for middle school teachers concerning the intersection of teachable moments and dialogic moments: Asymmetry, surprise and learning environments* (Master's thesis, University of Dubuque). Retrieved from www.dbq.edu/library/collectionsPDF/mccaw.pdf
- McNamee, S., & Shotter, J. (2004). Dialogue, creativity and change. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 91-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Miravel, J. (2006). *Getting nipped and tucked through talk: A communication take on cosmetic surgery* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado]. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Myhill, D. A. (2006). Talk, talk, talk: Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education*, 21, 19-41.
- Myhill, D. A., Jones, S., & Hopper, R. (2006). *Talking, listening learning: Effective talk in the primary classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas: Critical pedagogy and transformative social change*. New York: Teachers College Press (Teachers College, Columbia University).
- Mounce, H. O. (1997). *The two pragmatisms: From Peirce to Rorty*. London: Routledge.

- Nystrand, M. (2002). Dialogic discourse analysis of revision in response groups. In E. Barton & G. Stygall (Eds.), *Discourse studies in composition* (pp. 377-392). Cresskill, N.J: Hampton Press.
- Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 35, 135-196.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schiefflen (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York: Academic Press.
- Olmstead, M. (2007). A pedagogy of practicum supervision. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values relationships and practices* (pp. 138-148). London: Routledge.
- Palmer, P. J. (1999). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pearce, K. A. (2004) Reconceptualising teaching: Using CMM to change rules and relationships in the classroom. *The Journal of Systemic Consultation and Management*, 15, 77-88.
- Pearce, W. B., & Cronin, V. E. (1979). A model of hierarchical meanings in coherent conversation and a study of indirect responses. *Communication Monographs*, 46, 75-87.
- Pearce, W. B., Cronen, V. E., & Conklin, R. F. (1979). On what to look at when studying communication: A hierarchical model of actors' meanings. *Communication*, 4, 195-220.

- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000). Extending the theory of the coordinated management of meaning ("CMM") through a community dialogue process; *Communication Theory*, 10, 405-423.
- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2004). Taking a communication perspective on dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 39-56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peters, M. (2003). Derrida, pedagogy, and the calculation of the subject. In P. P. Triphonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference* (pp. 61-82). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Pinchevski, A. (2005). *By way of interruption: Levinas and the ethics of communication*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 152-164), London: Cambridge University Press.
- Poulakos, J. (1974). The components of dialogue. *Western Speech*, 38, 199-212.
- Rogers, C. R. (1994). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. In R. Anderson, K. N. Cissna, & R. C. Arnett (Eds.), *The reach of dialogue: Confirmation, voice and community* (pp. 126-140). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press. (Original work published 1957)
- Russell, T., & Loughran, J. (2007). *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationship, and practices*. London: Routledge.

- Sacks, H. (2006). The baby cried. The mommy picked it up. In A. Jaworski, & N. Coupland (Eds.). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.; pp. 239-245). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1966)
- Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Talk and Social structure. In A. Jaworski, & N. Coupland (Eds.). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.; pp. 86-97). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1991)
- Schwartz, D. L., Lindgren, R., & Lewis, S. (2009). Constructivism in an Age of Non-constructivist Assessments. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 34-61). London: Routledge.
- Seiler, W. J., Schuelke, L. D., & Lieb-Brilhart, B. (1984). *Communication for the contemporary classroom*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Shotter, J. (2000). Inside dialogic realities: From an abstract-systematic to a participatory holistic understanding of communication. *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 119-132.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Sotto, E. (1994). *When teaching becomes learning: A theory and practice of teaching*. London: Cassell.
- Stevenson, M. (1995). The power of influence: Effecting change by developing ownership. In C. Dudley-Marling and D. Searle (Eds.), *Who owns learning? Questions of autonomy, choice, and control* (pp. 128-141). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Stewart, J. (1978). Foundations of dialogic communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 183-201.
- Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. E. (2000). Dialogue as tensional, relational practice. *Southern Communication Journal*, 65, 224-242.
- Stewart, J., & Zediker, K. E., & Black, L. (2004). Relationships among philosophies of dialogue. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 21-38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sweller, J. (2009). What human cognitive architecture tells us about constructivism. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 127-144). London: Routledge.
- Talisse, R. B. (2000). *On Dewey: The reconstruction of philosophy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Taylor, J. R. (2004). Dialogue as of the search for sustainable organizational co-orientation. In R. Anderson, L. A. Baxter, & K. N. Cissna (Eds.), *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies* (pp. 125-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tedlock, D., & Mannheim, B. (Eds.). (1995). *The dialogic emergence of culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Thayer, H. S. (Ed.). (1982). *Pragmatism: The classic writings*. Cambridge: Hackett publishing.

- Tobias, S. (2009). An eclectic appraisal of the success or failure of constructivist instruction. In S. Tobias & T. M. Duffy (Eds.), *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* (pp. 335-350). London: Routledge.
- Tobias, S., & Duffy, T. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Constructivist instruction: Success or failure?* London: Routledge.
- Tracy, K. (1997a). *Colloquium: Dilemmas of academic discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tracy, K. (1997b). Interactional trouble in emergency service requests: A problem of frames. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 30, 315-343.
- Tracy, K. (2005). Reconstructing communicative practices: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In K. Fitch and R. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 301-319). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tracy, K., & Agne, R. (2002). "I just need to ask somebody some questions": Sensitivities in domestic dispute calls. In J. Cotterill (Ed.), *Language in the legal process* (pp. 75-89). London: St. Martins Press.
- Tracy, K., & Anderson, D. (1999). Relational positioning strategies in calls to the police: A dilemma. *Discourse Studies*, 1, 201-226.
- Tracy, K., & Ashcraft, C. (2001). Crafting policies about controversial values: How wording disputes manage a group dilemma. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 297-316.
- Tracy, K., & Carjuzaa, J. (1993). Identity enactment in intellectual discussion. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12, 171-194.
- Tracy, K., & Craig, R. T. (2010). Studying interaction in order to cultivate communicative practice: Action-implicative discourse analysis. In J. Streeck

- (Ed.), *New adventures in language and interaction* (pp. 145-165). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tracy, K. & Dimock, A. (2004). Meetings: Discursive sites for building and fragmenting community. In P. J. Kabfleisch (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 28* (pp. 127-165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tracy, K., & Muller, N. (1994). Talking about ideas: Academics' beliefs about appropriate communicative practices. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 27, 319-349.
- Tracy, K., & Muller, H. (2001). Diagnosing a school board's interactional trouble: Theorizing problem formulation. *Communication Theory*, 11, 84-104.
- Tracy, K., & Naughton, J. (1994). The identity work of questioning in intellectual discussion. *Communication Monographs*, 61, 281-302.
- Tracy, K., & Robles, J. S. (2010). Challenges of interviewers' institutional positionings: Taking account of interview content and the interaction. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 4, 266-289.
- Tracy, K., & Tracy, S. J. (1998). Rudeness at 911: Re-conceptualizing face and face-attack. *Human Communication Research*, 25, 225-251.
- Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of Workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20, 148-185.
- Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (1998). Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication*, 26, 390-411.

- Trees, A., & Jackson, M. (2007). The learning environment in clicker classrooms: Student processes of learning and involvement in large university-level courses using student response systems. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 32, 21-40.
- Triphonas, P. P. (2003). Toward a deconstructive pedagogy of *différance*. In P. P. Triphonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference* (pp. 220-235). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Usher, R., and Edwards, R. (2007) *Lifelong learning—Signs, discourses, practices*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and the denial of racism. In A. Jaworski, & N. Coupland (Eds.). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.; pp. 506-520). London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1992)
- Vella, J. (2001). *Taking learning to task*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Vella, J. (2008) *On Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Vella, J., & Associates. (2004) *Dialogue education at work: A case book*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Vella, J, Berardinelli, P., & Burrow, J. (1997). *How do they know they know?: Evaluating adult learning*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Approaches to studying classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). *The pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. New York: W. W. Norton.

- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning meaning and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wengraf, T. (2001). *Qualitative research interviewing: Biographic, narrative, and semi-structured methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2006). The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse Studies*, 8, 675-703.
- Wilkinson, L. C. (1981). Analysis of teacher-student interaction: Expectations communicated by conversational structure. In J. L. Green & C. Wallat, Eds.) *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 253-270). Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing.
- Zizzi, M. P. (2007). Using dialogic discourse analysis toward the formation of a pragmatic model of dialogue. Paper presented at the annual *National Communication Association Doctoral Honors Seminar*. University of Colorado - Boulder. July, 2007.
- Zizzi, M. P. (2008a). Toward a pragmatic model of dialogue. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Western States Communication Association. Broomfield/Interlocken, CO. February, 2008.
- Zizzi, M. P. (2008b). Can technology inspire students? Panel chair for the conference "data session" at the annual convention of the Rocky Mountain Communication Association. Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO. March, 2008.

APPENDIX A: Transcription Key

(())	Unintelligible speech
((word))	Transcriptionist doubt
(noise)	room sounds / nonverbal phenomenon, including <i>pauses</i> over 1 second in duration
[word/phrase]	Brief utterance interjected, by someone else, during a speaking turn
<i>word</i>	Word or syllable spoken with a notable attitudinal shift or emphasis, though not necessarily of raised volume
WORD	Word or syllable spoken with special force and emphasis, with notably raised volume
word- term	Hyphen shows interruption of speech flow (“repairs,” interruptions, etc.)
, . ! ?	Punctuation is included to aid readability and to indicate natural pauses and intonation (e.g., ? indicates rising pitch)

APPENDIX B: Discursive Log of a Complete, Two-hour Training Session

Session 1 (Year 1, Meeting 1: 2/7/07)

Session Topic/Focus: Introductions of participants and overview of the training to come

Location: Pelham Hall Computer Lab (prior to move to Center of Technology Bldg)

Total Time of Video Recording: 1:53:30 – in 86 logged turns

Notes:

- All utterances exceeding 10 seconds are considered a turn and are logged and characterized.
- Selected utterances briefer than 10 seconds are included, if significant/influential to ongoing discussion. If these interjections are brief and embedded in another speaker's turn, they are either mentioned or quoted directly within the turn characterization.
 - . example of brief utterance logged: "Why not just put it on College Learn?"
 - . example of brief utterance *not* logged: "I didn't catch your last name" / "Smith"
- Transcribed Excerpts: Selected interactions (usually involving three or more interlocutors engaged for more than two minutes) are transcribed fully following the session log.

Session Participants (in order of first logged utterance):

- 1) Nora Porter (NP), program director
- 2) Julia (Jul), graduate student, assigned to assist Ike
- 3) Ike (Ike), professor (sciences)
- 4) Vijay (VJ), program assistant director
- 5) Mike Z (MZ), researcher/videographer--participant/observer)
- 6) Dom (Dom), professor (humanities)
- 7) Jason (Jas), graduate student, assigned to assist Dom
- 8) Peg (Peg), professor (mass communication)
- 9) Emma (Em), technical staff/management
- 10) Joy (Joy), technical staff/management
- 11) Martin (Mar), technical staff/management

Screen Shot, from video: Yr1, Session1 – 2/7/07



Session Log – Session 1, 2/7/07

Turn # / Utterance timing (within DVD “Title”) / Speaker / Nature of turn

DVD “Title 1” -- recording time: 10:00 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

Note: The **DVD “titles”** are unintended, but now built-in, “chapters.” These occurred during transfer from digital tape to DVD.

1-0001 / T1-00:00-00:19: many spkrs: Pre-mtg chatter.

1-0002 / T1-00:19-00:25 -- NP: introduces J.

1-0003 / T1-00:26-00:56 -- Jul: introduces self.

1-0004 / T1-00:56-01:39 -- NP: cuts in, explains J’s program, introduces (I).

1-0005 / T1-01:37-03:28 -- Ike: introduces self.

1-0006 / T1-03:39-04:29 -- Vijay: introduces self.

1-0007 / T1-04:30-05:13 -- NP: asks mentions MZ’s research and asks MZ to introduce self.

1-0008 / T1-05:14-07:39 -- MZ: introduces self and explains research role and intent.

1-0009 / T1-07:40-08:10 -- NP: further introduces MZ; MZ passes out consent forms to be signed.

1-0010 / T1-05:14-07:39 -- MZ: introduces self and explains research role and intent.

1-0011 / T1-07:40-08:10 -- NP: further introduces MZ; MZ passes out consent forms; participants read and sign the forms.

1-0012 / T1-09:03-10:00 -- MZ: explains participant rights to have any/all recorded session discourse omitted from study.

DVD “Title 2” -- recording time: 5:07 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0013 / T2-00:00-00:15 -- many speakers (quiet chatter): consent forms collected; NP distributes course outlines.

1-0014 / T2-00:15-05:07 -- NP: explains course outline (for next four weeks). She explains why we are in this room (“Only one we could get.”) She begins to explain that the group will need to commit to an additional hour each week, for synchronous online group activity each week.

DVD “Title 3” -- recording time: 11:56 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

See Transcribed Session Excerpt 4 (in Appendix B)

1-0015 through 1-0034 / T3-00:13-02:46 --

NP requests specific input as to best time to schedule the weekly synchronous online activities, with comments from group. Despite some contradictions in the input she receives and the decision she makes, she makes a fairly quick and firm decision, and the issue is settled.

1-0035 / T3-02:47-05:58 -- NP: continues explanation of course log-on procedures, with some minor difficulties in the explanation, so she walks back to various computer stations and tries to help some people to log on, with some students attempting to help their neighbors, and some quick comments from group about how they are doing.

1-0036 / T3-05:58-06:13 -- Peg: questions whether the course she wishes to redesign through this training program is supposed to include one hour per week of synchronous online activity for her students.

1-0037 / T3-06:13-08:38 -- NP: explains that this issue will ultimately depend on each faculty member’s desires and needs, but for the purposes of this training course, it will be assumed that the faculty wish to incorporate one hour of synchronous online activity into their

three contact hours for the course they will work on during this training program.

1-0038 / T3-08:38-09:20 -- Em: discusses possible developments with videoconferencing technology

1-0039 / T3-09:20-10:18 -- Ike: asks why the group does not use an Apple/Mac software platform for videoconferencing that might be done during this program. Em explains that not everyone has a Mac computer and related accounts and software. NP offers quick interjections of affirmation, and Ike interjects some additional questions.

1-0040 / T3-10:18-11:56 -- NP: regains floor and continues her explanations of the coming program, including a reminder of the Monday lunchtime synchronous online activities.

DVD “Title 4” -- recording time: 10:09 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0041 / T4-00:00-00:23 -- NP: Wraps up her course overview and introduces Joy, who is a technical expert for the online site used for this training course.

1-0042 / T4-00:28-05:49 -- Joy: explains and demonstrates (using projector) some course features on WebCT and, soon, College Learn, with an occasional prompt from NP for additional information to be covered (e.g., how to find readings that are posted) and an occasional quick request for clarification from other participants.

See Transcribed Session Excerpt 2 (in Appendix B)

1-0043-0050 / T4-05:49-07:44 --

Ike breaks in with a critique that a better group-editing software system is available (Adobe Acrobat), with a noticeably choppy replies by Joy, who seems somewhat shaken at his challenge and receives some support from Vijay and Dom.

1-0051 T4-07:51-10:09 -- Joy: regains the floor for further explanation of the WebCT site, inviting “any other questions?” Dom asks a simple question (“What’s the difference between a discussion board and a chat room”); Joy answers easily and finishes her turn at the front of the room.

DVD “Title 5” -- recording time: 3:18 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

- 1-0052 / T5-00:00-00:23 -- Joy and Julia: make small talk briefly as Joy takes her seat
- 1-0053 / T5-00:24-00:32 -- NP: Asks if the group would like to take a ten-minute break, referencing the tardy Martin who should be in after this presumed break. Murmurs of yes and head nodding.
- 1-0054 / T5-00:33-01:58 -- Dom: asks if the group will be learning College Learn; Jul and NP answer yes, with quick explanations and follow-up questions by Dom and quick answers by NP and Joy
- 1-0055 / T5-02:00-03:18 -- various chit-chat as break begins

DVD “Title 6” -- blank—dubbing error (Session 1, 2/7/07)

DVD “Title 7- recording time: 3:00 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

- 1-0056 / T7-00:00-02:08 -- Group chit-chat during break; an uninvited student wanders in and takes a seat in the lab; NP walks up to him and escorts him right back out the door, which closes with a loud slam (NP: “Bang! That’s a heavy door!”)
- 1-0057 / T7-02:09-03:00 -- NP: hands out free books to the group (“These are a gift from the provost”) as the group continues break chit-chat.

DVD “Title 8” -- recording time: 1:14 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

- 1-0058 / T8-00:00-01:14 -- NP: further explains the project support from the provost, including finding the graduate students who are attending. She also, now holding the floor more clearly than at break, explains the two books she had given out during break.

DVD “Title 9” -- recording time: 5:30 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

- 1-0059 / T9-00:00-00:39 -- NP: Invites the three faculty members to come to the front of the room and explain the courses that they will be working developing as their main ongoing project during this semester-long training program, beginning with a quick, specific question for Ike, regarding the course he will work on during the training.
- 1-0060 / T9-00:39-00:45 -- Ike: answers NP’s question with humor and repartee from NP. (“It depends on what you want me to do”; NP: “It’s not what *I* want you to do”; Ike: “I’m not used to that” (laughter).
- 1-0061 / T9-00:47-01:27 -- Ike: then answers her question briefly and directly, after

which, NP paraphrases and clarifies his answer (“So ‘synergistic’ but not the same course). NP then invites Peg to take the floor to explain her course to be developed during the training. Peg: “Should I come up to the front?” NP: “Sure, come up to the front [Peg, ‘I’ll come up to the front.’] so we can all see your beautiful countenance.”

1-0062 / T9-01:39-05:30 -- Peg: explains that she has already changed her mind (“Uh, well, um, I’m already having a crisis of decision, because of things that have taken place this morning. . . so- uh- let me- if you don’t mind- do I have a couple minutes?” NP: “Yeah, take as much time- we’ve got an hour.”) Peg is now wanting to change the course she will modify, to take better advantage of the technology available in this training. Now she is considering working on a not-yet-existing course that she could prospectively teach to an international group of students, some here on campus and some, say, in China. This will help to modernize her course to reflect the current technology changes going on in mass media today.

DVD “Title 10” -- recording time: 11:30 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0063 / T10-00:00-00:11 -- NP: invites Dom to take the floor

1-0064 / T10-00:16-11:30 -- Dom: comes to the front of the room and explains the course he wants to work on – a course in recent American History. Also, he explains that he wants to use what he is learning to eventually revise a number of courses he teaches. At 02:46 Peg quickly asks for information about high-ranking US officials coming to campus for reasons related to a departmental project in which he has a role, and he replies in some detail, naming names and asserting project affiliations with other prestigious institutions (e.g., Stanford University, Hoover Institute, etc.).

DVD “Title 11” -- recording time: 1:52 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0065 / T11-00:00-00:10 -- NP: invites Mike to begin; as he declines to come forward, she asks that he at least stand up (“Stand up so we can hear you better”); he declines (Oh, you can hear me—I’m a professional”), and he begins to speak from his seat.

1-0066 / T11-00:12-01:52 -- Ike: Explains the course he will work on, making a major point about the failings of education, in general.

DVD “Title 12” -- recording time: 3:54 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0067 / T12-00:00-00:05 -- NP: invites Joy to begin; she speaks from her seat; no mention this time from NP about standing up, and she (who already spoke at length from the front of the room, being challenged there by Ike, in Excerpt 2, answers from her seat.

1-0068 / T12-00:12-03:51 -- Joy: Explains her agenda as a trainee, to help develop her TA training program at another area school, where she works full time.

DVD “Title 13” -- recording time: 6:13 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0069 / T13-00:00-00:36 -- NP: wonders what has happened to the missing invitee, Martin. Asks Em to check her e-mail to see if he has written in; she says no e-mail there, but she will call him on her cell phone

See Transcribed Session Excerpt 1 (in Appendix B)

1-0070-0080 / T13-00:36-06:13 --

Dom: Asks if we will be discussing philosophies of education, naming a legendary lecturer at the university. Ike explains at length how the qualities of the lecturer, especially if entertaining, have been shown, at least in the hard sciences, to have no effect on student learning. As the missing participant, Martin, enters the room, Dom reframes the exchange in terms of professorial communication skills; Ike asserts that the achievement of learning goals is nonetheless, in science, undervalued and “instructor independent.” And comments (in marked contradiction to the whole purpose of this training workshop just beginning) that teaching methods peaked with Socrates and have been going downhill since. NP closes the exchange with some conflict-calming affirmation from her own experience, regarding class sizes that have gotten out of control.

DVD “Title 14” -- recording time: 8:52 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0081 / T14-00:00-00:03 -- NP: invites Martin to come to the front introduce himself from the front of the room (Martin, come on up!) and explain his role.

1-0082 / T14-00:12-03:05 -- Martin: Explains his role and philosophy as a course tech expert and manager of faculty tech-assistants, called DATCs. As he speak, NP interrupts now and then, including at 2:20,

asking the group, including MZ, to all introduce themselves to Martin, at the conclusion of which, she retakes the floor and moves to conclude the session.

1-0083 / T14-03:05-07:54 -- NP: Moves to conclude the class session, including detailed reference to a pretest-posttest survey, the pretest of which is to be completed ASAP on Zoomerang (online survey service). This survey host-site is questioned by Ike (“Why not just put it on College Learn”), but NP justifies the choice quickly and moves on with further details, including a reminder to Martin that the synchronous online activity will be held Mondays at noon. She previews what will come in the next few sessions, including next week, with Joy as the main presenter.

1-0084 / T14-07:55-08:22 -- Joy: jumps in with an explanation of some of her coming material.

DVD “Title 15”(final “title”) -- recording time: 3:55 (Session 1, 2/7/07)

1-0085 / T15-08:22-08:52 -- NP: wraps up the session (“So any questions, comments, concerns? Everybody game to keep going? Sounds pretty exciting to me.”) MZ throws out a quick thank-you for the signed consent forms. Martin approaches MZ to sign his consent form, as some chit-chat goes on among the group, as they are packing up.

1-0086 / T15-00:00-003:55 -- NP: regains the floor with one last announcement. This is a request that anyone who knows of good, relevant articles should post them on the College Learn course site. She makes reference to the article Ike had mentioned (see transcribed Excerpt 2), when he challenged Dom’s appreciation for lecture that is engaging (to Ike, “entertaining”). (“So, Ike, your ‘Ersatz’ article would be a great one to have.”) And the participants say good-byes, some chatting in little groups, and they begin to leave the room, one by one, some stopping by MZ’s camcorder station to drop of their signed consent forms. Martin mentions to MZ that his “background is similar and in some ways the same” (as MZ’s) and for his own dissertation “I did an observational study and analyzed the discourse”; MZ “Oh, I might have to get some ideas from you!” And they agree that they should get together to talk. The room empties.

End of Log for Session 1

APPENDIX C: Example of Handwritten Logs of a Two-hour Training Session

Session Log, Week-6.a, as Noted/Written Live, During Videotaping

Wk 6
 3/14/07 Video Conf. DVD Log →
 audio has been going 5 mins - nice chat + substantive change
 Format Picture
 width 250
 00:00
 01:00 - TZ broadcast
 02:00 - Wanda Churchill
 03:00 - tech probs - some ppl. + me
 03:30 - intro by spkr
 04:00 - Mike K. "does this get evaluated?"
 04:30 - tech handed by spkr - 2d in?
 05:00 - end speech by spkr
 05:10 - LB - how did the talk progress over time
 05:30 - Mike K. on evaluation - FC class
 05:40 - ME - "there would be a learning outcome"
 05:50 - TZ - brass up email dis'n from sess 3
 06:00 - discuss the conflict/negative from her speech
 06:10 - LB
 06:30 - Meg - close up lights - story about CU students
 06:40 - Mike K. in
 06:50 - Julie Q - had more tech or device for community to prep the conf.
 07:00 - Mike K. - VR or other collab software
 07:10 - New Spkr on Video
 07:20 - "face or sexuality?"
 07:30 - intro video about the stream
 07:40 - Bvd
 07:50 - tech troubles!
 08:00 - video TV burner unvnc
 08:10 - Spkr back - some Qs
 08:20 - on water/water/tech. dis'n needed - ground rules
 08:30 - Bvd into's DVD - tech probs - DVD icon Bvd's effect
 08:40 - TZ cause PP? (some MK)
 08:50 - end Ch...
 09:00 - Julie turns on MK before asked "Bekayed your trust / write good"
 09:10 - camera moved around, w/ discie - on that + resolution/networking/soundwidth
 09:20 - Meg's I Marie Q - Bvd August
 09:30 - LB - Morning Star, ask a Q! Don't have one/Ask one! / Has one!
 09:40 - MZ goes for consents
 09:50 - MZ on firewire → tech tips/discn
 10:00 - PC v. Mac, etc., PP video
 10:10 - end w/ CD tech probs w/ chat!
 10:20 - 40404308
 Good video on morningstar
 Julie
 via monitor
 Good 15 min to look at

Session Log, Week-6.b, Detailed, as Noted/Written During Dubbing to DVD

4th time: the RIT in corners
metaphor for self-memorizing
while speaking (how big is the PIP?)

DVD WK 6 - Videoconference

00:00 Prelim Chat - Base ball stuff - Pete Rose says don't give those baseballs to Wend Church
06:00 in on Yankee stadium w/ dad to buy guitars (at 10:00)

11:15 → Lucy Sandels begins - asks for group notes in our room
tells history of videoconferencing exper/proj. w/ New Orleans college - pre Katrina
"bringing together, through technology, big 'white' school + small 'black' college → Dillard College?"

21:00 MK - is this just 'bad good' stuff, or did it make a difference
good give/take/crash MK + Lucy - I'm an assistant, I can poke holes too
learning gains? or just distracts people for a while / tech can accelerate good or bad

23:30 Lucy: → "Let's keep this issue in mind during my pres - then it doesn't pay over but up!" (with a later her about 11:50)

24:00 PIP
26:00 Good video shot of PIP in corner of screen as Lucy speaks
MK doing other work

30:00 → we had a horrible exper. w/ technology set-up / MK → "what was size/nature of the class -
31:00 → 2T stuffs run right and they did - Cu v. Dillard IT stuffs
34:00 → transition to "the 4th factors" of video conferencing - eg. presenters sometimes uncomfortable on camera
36:00 → one student variety of offense → faculty members got nervous - each group of fac. sided up their students
40:00 → parat awareness raised - water issues: too much for M.O. too like in far corners redacts surrounding room w/ p.c. screen
42:00 → LB - did you have how conversation flowed as time went on? Lucy: Dillard saw Cu like as too PC - grapple from God Dia. the video conf.

45 MK - tech or not? Students can't argue/think well - Now that would be a learning goal
47 Lucy: A point I wanted to get in there - best to "move" people around (F2 F visits) plus
48 → camera angles + lights discussed (unprofit)

50 → back to his e-mail/politess issues - Lucy - it came up in chat room (textual)
50 → Jamie jumps in - had done his HW - read the study sent to us!
50:30 Meg gets in - re "close ups" helpful/diff. → US students v. those in Pretoria S. Africa
53 → Mark comes into room - MK
- etiquette issues/grand rules needed - from Race to sexuality
- don't go into this type of sensitive stuff in first 5 mins - contradicts Lucy

56:00 → enter Bud's speech on screen - Meg comes in "close ups" confusing too
1:01 to 1:02 Bitchronic

00:00 → some tech glitches to get video up on our screen - Mark gets up - group works on which remote? which button?
4:15 → issues resolved group watches - Bud talks asks about Verbal v. non verbal / message proportions
4:40 → LB - Indian (and East) text missing its own language - Bud - to them, not strange but normal
13:20 → 2 more demonstrated
17:00 → TZ - Can you get this into PP? - basically not dealt with - no, just use I-move - true? 55:00 as all leave Julie jumps what TZ was asking

18:30 → Bud sets up Margaret Cho - chz - "Everybody's a little bit gay"
20:24 → good PIP reference shot - over study looking into camera while Cho is performing
25:00 → Bud ends his talk - TZ begins some Q/A after LB asks "what do you want to do?"
27:30 → Lucy on tech queries - mel.
30:31 → Meg asks about "how Bud did I move" (Lites windows) - Bud answers
32 → LB: Morning Gary, you didn't ask a Q - MG - I don't know any, then does ~~not~~ comment leads to (Bud) risk
35:50 → Lucy - when the conf. is over - be sure systems/mics are turned off
37:00 → Videoconference over - Julie breaks in with animated contribution
42 → TZ comment re firmware - MK discontinues w/ forming of AZ
43:00 → TZ's PP issue comes back to life - it's a much to likes - PJ "gets" it (44:05)
45-48 → lots of Dia. - mac v. PC - Fire sizes - Vista non-holds
48:30 → TZ - on PP again 49:00 → that's what I wanna do" 49th wise 50:00 Julie gives go l answer
→ performance M. ... 11th moment (M) 51:11 → 10th, OK now? are issue/production was in Rest Area

APPENDIX D: Training Session Excerpts

Training Session Excerpt 1: Dom, Ike, and NP Discuss Educational Philosophies

(Excerpt taken from near the conclusion of Training Session 1)

1 Dom Are we gonna be discussing any of- the
2 *philosophy* of- what we're doing- behind all
3 this? Something came up that Ike just said
4 that I have a question about. I know we're
5 in an interactive age, and I've seen, you
6 know, quite a few of the studies,
7 interaction and clickers is critical [NP: m-
8 hmm], but I can't help but thinking of Bob
9 Smith. I don't know if you knew Bob Smith
10 [NP: I loved Bob Smith], who was our
11 greatest lecturer ever. [NP: yep- yep] And I
12 don't know what students got out of the
13 class, [Ike: well they just-] but he could
14 make them cry and laugh, and he was just
15 great- and they remember that 30 years [NP:
16 yep] later.

17 Ike They remember the *emotion*. The question is,
18 are they being thought- are they being
19 taught to think critically about the
20 problem. I mean there's a- there *is* a
21 tendency to think that people who are
22 entertaining are educating. And- the
23 evidence in- in physics education research
24 is the- that it's- it's *instructor*
25 independent. Great lecturers, bad lecturers,
26 it doesn't make *any* difference when you
27 actually come down to understanding things
28 conceptually, and- and I *wonder* whether the-
29 the- the sort of *environment* of the
30 university doesn't favor entertainment over
31 education- until you get to the- I mean, I'm
32 *actually* quite convinced for example that
33 our whole controversial professor in the
34 national news thing is an entertainment,
35 versus education, issue because I don't
36 think people were learning to think
37 critically about what he was talking about.

38 They didn't question where his data was
 39 coming from. I mean, th- they don't- you
 40 gotta- and that's why this paper on ersatz
 41 learning and authentic testing is very good,
 42 because it's not about science; it's about
 43 history and English. So what *is* it you're
 44 asking the student to do? If- if you're not
 45 asking the student to do what a professional
 46 does, you're not *teaching* them. You're
 47 *entertaining* them, or, you know- the- how- I
 48 mean *great* lecturers can be inspiring, it's
 49 true. But the question is, what- what is the
 50 goal of education? It's to be able to DO
 51 something.

52 Dom I guess I would take issue with the-
 53 entertainment term. I'd say *communication*
 54 would be the key. We've got plenty of
 55 faculty who- who are brilliant, who can't
 56 communicate to a student. And they don't get
 57 anything out of the class. Um and- and
 58 they'll do the Web and they'll do all this
 59 stuff, and I don't know what the student-

60 Ike I know- it comes- it comes back to what you
 61 think education's *about*. I'm a- I am a- I'm
 62 convinced education (door slams as Em leaves
 63 the room) technology peaked with Socrates,
 64 and it hasn't gotten any better. And it's
 65 not about talking with the student. It's
 66 getting the *student*- it's *listening* to what
 67 the student thinks and challenging them in
 68 questioning them and getting *them* to
 69 understand. So it's- it's not sitting there
 70 *talking* to them. Talking to s- talking to
 71 people doesn't *teach* people anything. I mean
 72 that- I mean- [Dom: I see what you-] so- so
 73 the question becomes, well what is the *goal*
 74 right? And how do *measure* whether you're
 75 getting the goal or not. Right- I mean we-
 76 we have lots of students in science who go
 77 through a lot of our courses, and then they
 78 *don't* know how to- we have *graduate* students
 79 who they don't know how to design an
 80 experiment. They *can't* think like
 81 scientists, so what's the- what are we
 82 wasting all this time for? [Dom: yeah] There

83 are many people who are historians I'm sure,
 84 who don't think like, you know, objective
 85 historians. You know, they're- they're
 86 politicized in some way, as opposed to being
 87 ((dispassionate)) (Martin enters the room;
 88 door slams) I mean, for *my* money, you know,
 89 learning is- is about being- you know,
 90 being- being objective, and if you're gonna
 91 say what you're- you have to be able to *know*
 92 what you know and think about it- this is
 93 what I'm *assuming* and you can say what
 94 you're assuming. I don't know, I mean, it's
 95 an interesting- in *physics* education- this
 96 is what- [Dom: yeah] the *message* in physics
 97 education- people were *always* convinced they
 98 had students who were learning everything,
 99 and then you give them tests based on
 100 conceptual understanding, and the reality is
 101 they weren't. And I see that all the time in
 102 independent studies students. You ask them-
 103 you know- what does this *mean*? You had it in
 104 four *courses*, and they can't tell you. So
 105 their understanding is extremely brittle.
 106 They have all this- they have all these
 107 words, but they don't know what- they- they
 108 can't *use* them. And- so you produce- you
 109 *actually* produce people who *think* they know
 110 more than they do, which is probably the
 111 most dangerous commodity available on the
 112 face of the earth.

113 NP Vijay was talking about one of those
 114 (laughs) PhD exams the other day-

115 Ike I think it would be very interesting to talk
 116 about how you measure it. You know, if
 117 you're teaching something, how do you
 118 measure whether they *learned* it? What kind
 119 of *test* do you give? And what does your
 120 *assessment* look like? Does it *look* like what
 121 a professional in that field would *do*? Or is
 122 it spitting back things that somebody told
 123 you? [Dom: I guess part of our-] If it's
 124 spitting back things then it's not learning.

125 Dom I guess part of ours is the essay exams. You
 126 try to get them to *write* like a
 127 professional. But there's the other issue,

128 of course, of restructuring the whole- um-
 129 educational system *here*. You still have to
 130 teach 200 students in Intro to Physics- the
 131 (())-

132 Ike It's a problem. There's an economic- this
 133 gets back to the whole issue: who *cares* if
 134 the students really know it? [Dom: yeah] Is
 135 anybody paying attention to whether they
 136 come out of the classroom really knowing it?
 137 [Dom: yeah] We don't have any safe- we don't
 138 have any safeguards. We don't have any
 139 checks and balances. And in that context,
 140 that's how you get 500-student classes
 141 (someone's cell phone ringing)

142 NP Yeah, there was actually a research project
 143 done years ago. And I- I knew about it
 144 because I was a French teacher, and it- in
 145 the early days when I was teaching French,
 146 and it showed that if you went above 22
 147 students, you might as well have 50 or 100
 148 or 500, and *boom* - they DID have 500
 149 (laughs)

150 Ike Well I'm not even sure in critical thinking
 151 classes, 25- 25 may be way too many. I think
 152 probably 10 is the [NP: yeah] the max you
 153 can deal with.

154 NP And I always thought of *French*. I can teach
 155 French to 22, but when it got to 30, it got
 156 *really* hard. So- um- (pause) OKAY well *this*
 157 is (laughs) is a pretty exciting project.
 158 Martin, I wish you'd gotten to hear their-
 159 their talk about what they're going to do,
 160 but we do have it on tape, so you can
 161 listen, so you'll know what these faculty
 162 and grad students want to revise. . .

Training Session Excerpt 2: Nora and Group Discuss Scheduling of Weekly Online Chats

(Excerpt taken from near the beginning of Training Session 1)

1 NP . . . so it was- it was an interactive
2 screen. So Julia and I have had experience
3 last fall. Um, so the only piece of this
4 course that we hadn't pre-thought was any
5 kind of telephone interaction. But the
6 online- the online hour can be any time. But
7 we do- we do want it to be a synchronous
8 online. So what do you think about that? Do
9 you all have a -

10 Vijay 6 a.m.

11 NP 6 a.m.! (laughter)

12 Dom How 'bout the grad students? What are your
13 schedules?

14 Jason I'm better towards the end of the week.

15 NP I mean, does anyone have like a lunch hour?
16 Are you all- 'cause we could do a- Julia, do
17 you have any lunch hour?

18 Julia I eat lunch every day. (she laughs)

19 NP But, I mean, you don't have a course.

20 Julia No, I don't-

21 NP Does everybody have a- does anybody not have
22 a course at lunch?

23 Jason I have a course on Tuesdays and Thursdays
24 from 12:30 to 1:45.

25 Ike Yeah, me too.

26 NP So could we do a- could we do a Monday or a
27 Friday lunch- online?

28 Jason Friday?

29 Ike We're in the middle of faculty recruitment.
30 So we often have chalk talks (()) I might-
31 I might have to miss some- Probably done by
32 Febru-

33 NP Is it more- is it more likely on Friday or
34 on Monday?

35 Ike Uh, it's more likely on Friday. But I'll be
36 done at the end of February.

37 NP So would Monday at lunch work for- everyone?
38 That we could have a synchronous online?
39 Let's do Monday at lunch- that's- that's
40 fine for me.

41 Jason 12 to 1? - Just-?

42 NP Yes just 12- and it only has to be 50
43 minutes 'cause it's like a course so from 12
44 to 12:50, so you can get on with whatever
45 you have to do at 1 o'clock. And basically
46 then what we will all do is um- (taps
47 computer keyboard) wake up! We'll all log
48 into this course. Now Martin is in the
49 process of getting- our test course- morphed
50 into College-Learn. He- he put that in
51 action, Joy. Um, for some reason our- our
52 test courses didn't just morph to College-
53 Learn, so ours is still on College-Learn
54 right now- I mean, still on WebCT, but
55 probably by tomorrow or Friday it'll- it'll
56 morph to College Learn. Um, and so then,
57 basically at noon on Mondays we'll each
58 just- log on and be able to interact
59 synchronously in the course environment.
60 'Kay? So let's look at this.

Training Session Excerpt 3: Peg's Protest, Part 1: Comments Made with Session Ending

(Excerpt taken as NP moves to conclude Training Session 5)

1 NP So anyway. Okay, well, we need to wrap up.
2 But you get the idea.

3 Peg Before we wrap up, can I just raise one
4 thing, which is uh issues of technology? I'm
5 actually a little worried that things that I
6 thought were gonna *happen* are *not* gonna
7 happen. Like I wanted to know how to do a
8 *podcast* and I wanted to know how to do this,
9 that and the other and-

10 Vijay Podcasts are coming up, right?

11 NP Yeah. We're actually gonna do a podcast-

12 Peg Anyway, I'm just- can- can we have a brief
13 discussion [NP: Yeah- yeah- yeah] about this
14 part of things?

15 NP And so why don't you- on the discussion
16 (pause) um, *add* some discussion about what
17 you'd like to see done, and then Martin and
18 Cleve and Stan, 'n we can- we've *got* time
19 to- I mean, we've *built* time into that. In
20 April- you know we've got different people
21 coming in. So, to go back to I think Dom's
22 question in the discussion group is why are
23 we doing all this educationese (laughs; some
24 other voices are heard) in- instead of the
25 technology, and I think- I can't remember if
26 I answered or if I just thought about it,
27 but anyway, what we're *trying* to do with
28 this course redesign project is not just
29 *plug in* a technology into whatever you're
30 doing. . .

31 NP . . . But we're trying to actually- and this
32 is- and this is an experiment- that we're
33 doing. Um, is we're trying to take some of
34 the educational stuff that we've worked on
35 and see if we can help people do a *better*
36 job of redesigning their courses. And then
37 [Ike: Sure] picking technologies that are

38 actually, you know, help you think about
 39 'well what am I really after?' And then pick
 40 technologies that really get at, you know,
 41 what are you really after kind of stuff, and
 42 uh-

43 Peg Yeah, I understand, but um I just wanna
 44 respond for myself. I don't think in terms
 45 of Kolb. I don't and I probably never will.
 46 And I don't think in terms of, what is this,
 47 'Wingspan' and the other thing. I mean, I
 48 think a *lot* about my classes, and I think a
 49 lot about assignments, and I can see what
 50 works and what *doesn't*. But I just don't
 51 think in those terms. And so I don't know. I
 52 mean, I just kind of feel like (pauses, then
 53 slows down speech rate) once I had some
 54 technology *going* in a [NP: yeah] class, I
 55 would have a good sense of this absolutely
 56 is *not* working, [Ike: right] this is *great*
 57 [NP: yeah] or whatever, and I wouldn't be
 58 plugging it back through Kolb, because it
 59 doesn't do this or that. So-

60 NP Yeah- we- we're certainly not requiring you
 61 to *do* that. You know, we're not saying- I
 62 mean, we're not gonna have any exercises
 63 where you have to apply technology to Kolb
 64 or anything. [Peg: Yeah-no-no-I-I] But we're
 65 trying to give- you know- kind of give a
 66 *picture* of how like what Martin was trying
 67 to do and we- and we need to spend more time
 68 on what *Martin* was doing- but give kind of
 69 a- a- a *background* of if you're trying to
 70 get something, which ones might give you the
 71 biggest bang for your buck.

72 Vijay But- but one thing, I want to point out is
 73 ((for instance)) (someone coughing) we *did*
 74 put up a discussion thread and asking 'what
 75 technologies *would* you like us to see used.'
 76 Very few people responded to that. So-

77 Peg I'm- I'm still going to post something ((
 78)) I'm still gonna figure that out-

79 (Several people talking at once)

80 Peg Okay, that's fine I'm just raising it here

81 and now. [NP and Ike: Yeah] And I- kinda
 82 with respect to *how* the time is used in the
 83 course, because this is very interesting
 84 stuff and all of that, but it doesn't get *me*
 85 one inch closer to getting a technology- to
 86 get- getting more, whatever you wanna say,
 87 experiential hands-on, uh, *comfort* level
 88 with technology. And that's what-

89 Ike And once you play with it then you- then you
 90 see whether you can- whether it does what
 91 you want.

92 Vijay And that leads to (()) what specific
 93 ((skill)) is it [Ike: Soon as you get to
 94 try it-] that you would like to-

95 Dom That's what I ((need to answer))- I don't
 96 know-

97 Vijay -Yeah, you don't know, but- I mean-

98 Dom I mean- I can barely do *e-mail*, so I-
 99 [Vijay: Which is a-] I need twenty minutes
 100 on each one of those items, just to see what
 101 they are [NP: Yeah] I mean- you know-
 102 *podcasts* ((I had to go to one of my kids))
 103 [Peg: Yeah, yeah]

104 Peg And- and just one other thing. I- was it
 105 Julia who did the presentation on the
 106 *pretest* and all of that and the things that
 107 she asked her students before-

108 Vijay That was Joy-

109 NP Joy- (Dom and Jason are chatting.)

110 Peg Now *that* was *great*- I found that very
 111 interesting. But I also left thinking it
 112 would take *weeks* to design a test like that.
 113 How- y'know- is *that*- am I really gonna *do*
 114 something like that? But anyway, um, I just
 115 wanted to put that (volume fading) on the
 116 table.

117 Ike I know (())

118 NP Now one of- okay- speak- speaking of
 119 technology, Guys- uh, Ike, could you s- s-
 120 just stop a second? One of the technologies
 121 we're introducing you to is *blogging*. Yeah

122 And so you're going to get- y-

123 Dom (softly) That's fine.

124 NP You're going to have to set up your own
125 *blog*. And then I set up a *course blog*. And
126 I'm going (Ike interrupts unintelligibly
127 toward Vijay) to invite you to the *course*
128 *blog*. But until you set up your own- and
129 we've got the directions and we'll e-mail
130 these to you (Vijay softly interjects, to
131 Ike, that the web tool is "Blogger")- until
132 you set up your own blog we can't invite you
133 to *course blog*.

134 Peg Okay, so- just so-

135 NP We're *trying* to use some of these
136 technologies [Peg: as an example-] to help
137 you *learn* to use them.

138 Peg Okay. So on that point, would it be possible
139 to do a *Wednesday* class where we're *all* here
140 on computers setting up blogs. And then when
141 I got a question *Stan's* right there or
142 you're right there- or- you know what I
143 mean? So that-

144 NP Well, it's basically just e-mail. Uh- you
145 don't really have to set it up. [Peg: Okay-
146 alright] It's just e-mail.

147 Peg Alright (she rises to leave)

148 NP And so we're trying [Ike: But sometimes just
149 seeing it is-] to do it in the environment
150 where it is.

151 Ike Sometimes that first *seeing* it- saying it's
152 just this or just that [NP: Yeah] Yeah, it's
153 *true*, but there's a big activation energy
154 between "it's just this" and *doing* it-

155 Martin Real quickly- you and Stan, feel free to be
156 working (laughs) on technologies and- you
157 know- and Cleve- (()) and-

158 NP And Stan *should* be working with you, Peg,
159 about *thinking* about these things, too. So
160 we've got a-

161 Peg No I- I understand-

162 Ike But it *can* make a big difference, even if
163 it's *trivial*, to see it done.

164 NP To see it done. Okay.

165 Dom: The hands-on, in-class, yeah-

166 Ike Nothing is- there- there's nothing scarier
167 than doing something you haven't done
168 before, even if five seconds after you've
169 started you're ((licensed to go)).

170 NP Okay. Have a good week. See you.

Training Session Excerpt 4: Peg's Protest, Part 2: The Post-Meeting *Meeting*

(Excerpt taken just after the formal conclusion of Training Session 5)

(In the noisy background, people, many still seated, are packing up and chatting, in pairs. NP steps over to a cell phone on a table and speaks to Julia, who is listening in, speakerphone-style, from home.)

1 NP Hi Jules. You still there?

2 Julia Yeah, I'm still here. Are we breaking for

3 today?-

4 NP Yeah, we're done. How are you doing? Are you

5 well?

6 Julia I'm okay. (()) I've got a cold, so I'm

7 staying home and working here, so

8 NP So are you gonna be here tomorrow, for the

9 Eiger seminar?

10 Julia Yeah, I plan to.

11 NP Okay, Alright. See you tomorrow. Cheers.

12 [Julia: Bye] Bye.

13 Peg (to Stan, right next to her) And so I don't

14 feel I need, like, the diversity stuff. I'm

15 TOfally for diversity. I'm usually

16 presenting- I'm usually the person

17 presenting in the diversity workshops. So I

18 don't want to spend two hours listening to

19 Judd talking about diVIRsity!

20 (Peg notices NP observing and listening to

21 her comment to Stan, then starts walking

22 around toward NP, continuing to gesture and

23 speak.)

24 Peg I'm- what I'm- I'm just continuing the same

25 thing, and I don't mind- if you don't mind

26 hearing it, I don't mind saying it. (She

27 continues making her way around the back of

28 the room, passing by several still-seated

29 participants) So, just as *another* example,

30 you've got (pause) so you have to- now *take*

31 this in the context of I'm a *student*- I'm

32 coming-

33 NP Yeah-

34 Peg So, *I* want the two hours to be used
 35 primarily for me to get info- exposure to
 36 *hands-on* with technology. But instead, I've
 37 got Judd coming to talk about diversity. I-
 38 understand totally- okay- okay- but- that is
 39 something I probably *do* know about myself. A
 40 lot (()).

41 So, anyway- but the stuff that I *don't* know
 42 about is the *newer* technology. So I know how
 43 to show a film. I really *do* know how to show
 44 a film. Uh- and you know put a VHS in- or a
 45 DVD- so- but (pause)

46 Peg And- and again, kind of thinking in terms of
 47 this *distance* technology [NP: Yeah], *that* is
 48 gonna be like *whoa*, what happens with this?

49 NP (nodding): Yeah.

50 Peg So *that's* all I-

51 NP Yeah- no- I hear you-

52 Peg I just wanted to- you know-

53 NP (nodding) Okay-

54 Peg Okay.

55 NP Good. Good. And I'll make sure Lacy does the
 56 technology part.)

57 Peg Okay. Cool. Great. [NP: Okay] Thanks. (Peg
 58 abruptly turns and starts walking briskly
 59 back toward the exit.)

60 NP She's from a big telecom, so she ought to be
 61 able to-

62 Peg Yeah- okay (she and Stan are now almost to
 63 the doorway).

64 (Vijay, now standing and holding some papers
 65 and also his coffee mug, approaches MZ, who
 66 is still behind the camcorder.)

67 Vijay Don't forget your recorder. [MZ: Oh- thank
 68 you] Otherwise I'll be forced to squish it.
 69 (Both give a forced-sounding laugh, and
 70 Vijay looks directly into the camera.) If it
 71 shows up- if it shows up as lost again, I'll
 72 just take it home with me (he laughs).

73 MZ There you go (he turns off the camera).

Training Session Excerpt 5: The Group Discusses Problems Showing Films in Class

(Excerpt taken near the conclusion of Training Session 6)

- 1 M'star Well, that was interesting-
- 2 Dom That was interesting, yeah.
- 3 Julia So I've made (clears throat)- I made uh- a
 4 movie using the i-movie. Um- and- like- I'm-
 5 I'm Mac. I had to have- like the *pictures* on
 6 the computer and the music on the computer?
 7 And once they were there, the i-movie
 8 software, like you were saying, is really
 9 easy to just drag and drop. And it also has
 10 *text* that you can put in? So I have like
 11 *credits* rolling at the end, and I've got a
 12 title at the beginning and stuff like that.
- 13 So, it's an- I mean, I'm *kind of* tech savvy?
 14 But it's really user-friendly too, just so
 15 you- and I can *show* you- I can show you the
 16 *movie*, and I can also show you, since I have
 17 music and- and photos on my computer I can
 18 also show you- just like, "Look I dragged
 19 and dropped, but now I have a movie."
 20 (laughs) That's what I'm saying.
- 21 Peg Well, you know, this is *really*-
- 22 NP 229, right around there (said to a person
 23 who just entered the room by accident)
- 24 Peg What I'm gonna be *trying* to do. I mean one-
 25 in one configuration of this *course*, they're
 26 sitting in a room with a screen and they
 27 watch a whole movie. [Jason: right] But then
 28 when we *discuss* the movie I want to be able
 29 to excerpt little parts and say "okay now,
 30 this is the scene where *this* happens" and so
 31 on-
- 32 Ike But there's also free software you can get,
 33 that allows you to- to edit movies and cut
 34 out clips [Peg: uh-huh] and save them as
 35 individual clips.
- 36 Jason Is i- is i-movie as-
- 37 NP (To Dom, across the table) Why is ((Jill))

38 showing up on there, still? (She is looking
 39 over toward the videoconferencing screen,
 40 and Dom looks over there, too, to see what
 41 she means.)

42 Jason Is i-movie as compatible with PCs as i-tunes
 43 is?

44 (Ike and Julia compete for the floor; Ike
 45 gains the floor)

46 Julia Well I think-

47 Ike No. There's no i-movie for PCs.

48 Julia At the end- after you-

49 Jason But can you use it on it- can you download
 50 like-

51 Julia (louder, regaining the floor) You burn it as
 52 a *Quicktime* movie. So I've got like- my
 53 movie is a Quicktime, and so I can- I *burned*
 54 it to DVD. And I can also send it to people
 55 who have PCs, so they can just- if they have
 56 Quicktime, they can watch it-

57 NP They hung up, but they're still up there.

58 Jason Right. But I'm saying can you operate either
 59 of them within a PC. Like on *my* PC, can I do
 60 it just as easily as i-tunes?

61 Julia Oh, no, probably not.

62 Martin There *is* a- there is a Windows version of-

63 Dom But you *can* pop it into the DVD player in
 64 the smart room.

65 Julia (softly) I think so.

66 Ike (to Martin) No. There's no version of i-
 67 movie for PCs.

68 (at this point several voice start speaking
 69 simultaneously, seemingly in two separate
 70 conversations, as Dom regains the floor,
 71 speaking to Julia next to him)

72 Dom I PowerPointed- I PowerPointed a whole
 73 course. I asked Cleve, who's *our* tech guy in
 74 humanities, if I could then in- *integrate*
 75 *into* that powerpoint, uh clips. Um, and *he*
 76 suggested, "No, do a separate, uh, CD."

77 Julia Well what do- you had some- you had clips in
 78 powerpoint, didn't you?

79 (As NP begins to answer Julia, three or four
 80 people begin speaking at once, in two or
 81 more conversations and some other room
 82 noise, including the entrance of a tech
 83 helper who goes over to Peg and helps her
 84 shut down her laptop. In the hubbub Dom's
 85 voice breaks through, toward Martin.)

86 Dom No, I use a PC.

87 Ike There's a *reason* why people use Macs.

88 Martin There's- there *is* a pro- a product that does
 89 what I think Cleve's-

90 Ike Yeah, but it's on PC, and it's *painful* and
 91 unpleasant-

92 Dom Yeah, my *concern* was that I'm lecturing and
 93 doing PowerPoint- I got the image and text
 94 up and then I say "Oh and let me show you a
 95 clip of Martin Luther King's speech"-

96 Ike (interrupting and overlapping Dom's last few
 97 words) You can *import* things- you can
 98 import- you can- you can *embed* a QuickTime
 99 movie into PowerPoint.

100 Martin (softly) That can be problematic-

101 Dom And *he* said it was a *risk*- he said 'cuz you
 102 could-

103 Ike Yeah because Windows- Windows software is
 104 designed to screw you up.

105 (Ike and NP start talking simultaneously,
 106 then NP breaks through)

107 NP I have a little mov- I have a little *tiny*
 108 movie in my PowerPoint on learning styles
 109 [Dom: yeah- yeah- yeah] when the bridge goes
 110 (())

111 Ike So it's doable.

112 M'star What about just-

113 Ike Could get- could get a new Mac and run it
 114 with-'cause the new ones can run Windows at
 115 the same time as- as the- so you can run

116 both.
117 Dom Maybe I should *do* that and-
118 Ike 'Cause they *do*. You can run both, 'Cause
119 they're both, you know (())
120 Dom Maybe I will get a Mac
121 Ike They're too easy. You won't like it (laughs)
122 Dom Are they? (several people laugh)

Training Session Excerpt 6: Peg and Dom Clarify their Problem

(Excerpt continues toward the conclusion of Training Session 6)

123 NP Who ever thought, when you studied history,
 124 you'd have to become a film technician?

125 Dom (shaking his head) No kidding. Well- but
 126 *again*- um- Cleve *warned* me *not* to do all
 127 this dragging and dropping into my
 128 PowerPoint. To bring a separate CD, and pop
 129 it into the DVD player [Julia: yeah] And
 130 then when I'm ready to show that clip, at
 131 least I have it there I just- I just *change*
 132 the *projector*, actually. You know I change
 133 the settings.

134 NP That's what I do, and *usually* it works

135 Dom Yeah, but-

136 NP About every other third time (laughs) the
 137 DVD won't work on the DVD player (laughs)-

138 Peg (to Dom) And what was the *reason* your
 139 PowerPoint would be *what*?

140 Dom He thinks-

141 Martin The quality would be *much*, much better-

142 NP Yeah, the quality is much better

143 Peg The DVD quality.

144 Martin Much better.

145 Vijay But that is a- that's *improving* though,
 146 isn't it, with PowerPoint?

147 Martin You still can't match DVD quality inside a
 148 PowerPoint-

149 Vijay Yeah but there is- there *is* something to be
 150 said for being able to have *one* thing
 151 [Julia: yeah], and not have to deal with
 152 other machines-

153 Julia (with Ike coming in and talking over her
 154 briefly) 'Cause even when you click on
 155 something in PowerPoint, sometimes when you
 156 click on it, it *opens* another application
 157 [Ike: right] or another application has to

158 be opened, and in i-movie, if everything is
 159 just integrated, there's just one
 160 application, so-

161 Dom But 'chure in the middle of a lecture, and I
 162 have to go back to the projector and say
 163 okay ((now I have to))- that's why I *like*
 164 having the one-

165 Ike But some people use *Acrobat*. Some people
 166 plug things into *Acrobat* [Julia: mm-hmm]-
 167 and use it so that the people who *really*
 168 hate PowerPoint will use- will use *Acrobat*.
 169 [Julia: yeah] (laughs)

170 Martin I think I would do *both*- just have one s-
 171 have one *standby*, depending on where you're
 172 going-

173 NP How big a computer can you *buy*? I mean how-
 174 how many gigabytes? You know-

175 Vijay Y- you're getting close to be able to get
 176 *terabytes* in computers-

177 Julia I've [Ike (talking over Julia): but *not* on a
 178 laptop. Sorry not on a laptop] got like 60
 179 on this- 60 gigs, that's all-

180 Vijay You can get about 250 gigs [Ike: *max*] on a
 181 laptop

182 Ike Yeah, and it doesn't take long to fill up
 183 250 gigs with HD video [MZ: mm-hmm]

184 Dom How much was that clip they just showed, of
 185 the transvestite-

186 Ike It depends on what- it depends on what
 187 resolution it- if it's *standard*- if it's
 188 standard video, which is 460- 480- what is
 189 it 480 by 640, that's not very big. Those
 190 aren't very big files, and they're not high
 191 resolution audio, so they're not that big-
 192 they're- they're a few hundred megabytes.

193 M'star Th- *that* could be up to a gigabyte, though,
 194 I mean-

195 Ike It *could* be- I mean, it depends how high the
 196 *resolution* is-

197 M'star It depends on- yeah-

198 MZ Think of-

199 M'star the resolution that you ((bring))-

200 Julia My 20- I have a 20- the 20-minute movie that
 201 I made (she closes-up her laptop) with all
 202 *still* photos- I can't remember what the
 203 resolution of the *photos* is that I used,
 204 but- um- is just under four gigabytes, for a
 205 20-minutes. [MZ: whistles]

206 Peg Well, going back to your thing- with
 207 changing, I was doing that course, which you
 208 (to Morningstar) were in, and, so- I mean,
 209 here's the scenario *I* envision. So you've
 210 got'chure your little DVD with your clips on
 211 it. Then- and it's *all* lined up, and you're
 212 gonna do it *in* order. And then, you get to,
 213 like the *third* clip, and it goes back to
 214 [Ike: the beginning] the *first*, or you gotta
 215 go back to the menu, or- I mean it's just
 216 extremely *frustrating*.

217 It interrupts everything in the class, and
 218 so, in- for *me*, there's a way in which *I'm*
 219 willing to take the trade-off of lower
 220 resolution, to have the- you know, the
 221 continuity of one [Dom: exactly] DVD and
 222 (clears throat) you know it- the way I'm
 223 thinking about *my* class, *that's* not where
 224 they're- in that *clip*- that's not where
 225 they're looking at the movie. That's where
 226 they're *talking* about the movie [Ike: right]
 227 And so if it isn't perfect, that- I don't
 228 care.

229 Ike Then you could have save those as individual
 230 files. Like, you know, this is the first
 231 clip I want to show, this is the second clip
 232 [Dom: right], this is the third clip.
 233 [Julia: mm-hmm] So that you're not- you're
 234 not trying to move around in a big huge
 235 file.

236 Peg Right, no, I want it like in *one* place where
 237 it just- like goes "click" and there's the
 238 next thing, *right* there. You know, *like* a
 239 PowerPoint where you just *click* to go to
 240 from page to page?- that it's embedded in

241 that?- and it's right there. So-

242 Ike I know some people who have- have been using

243 the- the Mac- a version of PowerPoint- it's

244 called keynote. And tha- that's very good

245 for video, according to people, because,

246 it's designed- because it's *designed* to take

247 video. See, Macs are more video-audio

248 centric. Every and PC is like added on to

249 the PC, not embedded into the operating

250 system.

251 Peg So is this gonna be- part of the-

252 (overlapping speech follows in next three

253 turns)

254 Vijay This is changing-

255 Ike So you say (laughs)-

256 Peg um- *demo*? Is this another part of the demo?

257 Julia I've heard- I've heard that PCs are s-

258 there's some new software in PCs that

259 [Vijay, to Ike: it's a lot better] people

260 are arguing are *much*- like- they're giving

261 the Mac video and audio a run for its money-

262 Vijay With the new stuff embedded in Vista, it's a

263 lot bet- it's-

264 Dom Is it safe to *buy* it now?

265 Vijay Um, I haven't actually had *any* problem with

266 it. I *bought* it the week it came out, and

267 installed it, and it's- I haven't had *any*

268 problem with Vista whatsoever. (pause) I've

269 been remarkably surprised at how much better

270 some of the things like that have been.

271 NP Buy plenty of memory when you buy it.

272 Julia Yeah, as much as you can.

273 Vijay It's very *ram* intensive.

274 Martin Look at what ((did)). He went through

275 *all* these debates and- I don't know what he

276 ended up with-

277 Dom A tremendous amount of memory-

278 Martin Did he buy a PC or Mac? I think he bought a

279 *Mac*, didn't he? (pause) But he- he went

280 through all these machinations and-

281 Vijay Um- um- there's also something to be said
 282 with whatever platform you're familiar with,
 283 too-

284 (Julia, whose hair is now fixed, clears her
 285 throat, as if readying herself to speak)

286 NP Have you used *Keynote*, Julia?

287 Julia No, not yet-

288 Ike I have. It's easy.

289 NP Is it easy?

290 Dom Yeah, I'm like Meg, though. I wanna- I walk
 291 into a class-

292 Ike You want easy-

293 (Dom raises volume and holds the floor)

294 Dom A lecture class with 200 students- I- and I-
 295 God, here I thought I was hip, with my
 296 PowerPoint- people aren't even
 297 PowerPointing- (Peg laughs) put up my
 298 PowerPoint and say "Here is the slide show"
 299 but I also have captions under there so I
 300 don't have to have outlines anymore, and
 301 then I wanna say, "Okay, here's Martin
 302 Luther King, and here's the- here's him
 303 marching, and now I'm gonna show you a clip
 304 for a minute and a half, on the, march on
 305 Washington speech, the 'I have a Dream'
 306 speech."

307 That's what I wanna do, and then go back to
 308 the Pow- and then continue the lecture.
 309 That's what I wanna do. I don't wanna have
 310 to- if *before* class, though, I have my- I
 311 set up my PowerPoint and I also slip in a
 312 CD, where I know now I can just- all I have
 313 to do is switch the *projector*- but even
 314 *that's* sort of a pain.

315 Julia Yeah- and-

316 NP So- in the *new* players, you can stop better.
 317 Like I- I've got- I've got *new* computers
 318 now, and they- they- you can *tell* which- um,
 319 video you're on [Peg: mm-hmm] more easily?

320 And in the *old* way, it just played right
 321 through, you know? And my new- my new one I
 322 can actually see is it on the first one or
 323 the second one, but some- but the other day,
 324 when I was playing it, it went BACK. And I
 325 didn't *make* it go back, and I don't know *why*
 326 it went back, but I didn't make it go-

327 Julia School- well in the *school* of education,
 328 there- um- I observed a class last semester,
 329 ca- the s- science for elementary teachers?
 330 And the- my office mate was the person
 331 teaching the class, and what *he* did, to do
 332 something like what you're saying, he just
 333 had two applications ready to go, and he- I
 334 mean it's partly just because he can move
 335 between the applications pretty fluidly.

336 So he'd be talking through a PowerPoint and
 337 then he'd be like "now let's watch this
 338 video [Dom: okay]- uh- of these students
 339 *talking* about the same scientific concept,
 340 like elementary students. And he'd *flip* over
 341 to QuickTime, he'd play the video, and it
 342 would just be the- like three-minute clip-

343 Dom So he'd *click* over to QuickTime-

344 Julia Yep- and-

345 Dom Okay, and minim- okay.

346 Julia He would just minimize the *PowerPoint* and
 347 maximize-

348 (Ike breaks in while Julia is speaking and
 349 she stops speaking)

350 Ike Yeah, see *I*- the way- the way *I* do it, I
 351 don't even open PowerPoint in the [Julia:
 352 so] projection mode. I just- you know I have
 353 it- 'cause I use i-clickers, which- which go
 354 on *top* of things and I really hate them,
 355 'cause the question comes in the middle.

356 So I don't even o- open- I never use the
 357 full-screen mode for PowerPoint. So I just
 358 have it fairly *big*, and you flip back and
 359 forth really easy on the Mac, for- for the-
 360 and just go *back* to the window you want,
 361 then turn that on.

362 Julia Yeah- (Julia bids for the floor, but there
363 are multiple voices, including Ike's who
364 continues over her speech, continuing his
365 own)

366 Julia He just uses alt-tab kind of stuff-

367 Ike (with/over Julia) -then back to the i-
368 that's really easy-

369 Dom Okay, well, if I can use- if I can do that
370 or a *mouse*, that's different than having to
371 go to the *projector*, and-

372 Ike No-no you don't wanna go to the *projector*.
373 That's a pain in the butt-

374 Julia (regaining floor) Right- right- so once
375 the- *once* his screen is projected, then he
376 just moves back- back and forth on his
377 computer screen, and he doesn't deal with
378 moving things around between different
379 media- whatever.

Training Session Excerpt 7: Julia Breaks Through, with a Breakthrough

(Excerpt concludes Training Session 6)

380 Julia (to Martin) Will this show my computer?
 381 (NP gains the floor, to dismiss the group)
 382 NP Okay, well I think it's past time, [Julia:
 383 oh, it is?] and I think and we should
 384 probably wrap up the-
 385 Dom This was interesting.
 386 (the next few turns overlap, as people seem
 387 confused as to whether the session is
 388 actually over)
 389 NP This was fun and this-
 390 Julia (to Dom) Oh forget it, yeah. I was gonna
 391 show you how- I can show you this-
 392 Ike Let's do that, and I gotta meet-
 393 Dom Yeah-
 394 Julia (As Julia speaks and clicks her mouse, a
 395 crowd begins to gather behind her.) Yeah,
 396 this is just like- this is an example of it.
 397 Here's a PowerPoint [Dom: Here's your a
 398 PowerPoint] and you can click through,
 399 right. [Dom: right] And you can just alt-
 400 tab. And you can alt-tab on your PC, too,
 401 and you know, show the movie and then when
 402 the movie starts (voice trails off). You
 403 know th- my students would see exactly what
 404 you're seeing here. I guess I could
 405 probably-
 406 Dom Well *this* is very useful! (gestures, as in
 407 relief)
 408 Martin So next- next time what we're planning on
 409 doing, is having- (The group is not
 410 listening; they are watching Julia with
 411 interest.)
 412 Julia And so then the movie just *plays* for however
 413 long, and then [Martin: oh!] and then I can
 414 just pause it-

415 Martin We're planning on having Stan and Cleve-
416 present a wide variety of technology, to
417 give kind of a demo- and let you see what's
418 possible.

419 Julia (over Martin) *Or* if it's just two minutes
420 long it will run out, and I can go *back* here
421 and go through *more*, and then I can go back
422 and play it some *more*. And so that's- I
423 don't know

424 Ike Once you get- once you get *used* to it-

425 NP But she's got 60 gigabytes on hers-

426 Julia Yeah, but I have a very- I mean

427 Ike That's a small hard drive.

428 Vijay That's small.

429 MZ The RAM, too- you need the RAM to match.

430 Julia This is- this is so many years old (laughs)

431 Ike This is an old computer-

432 Julia A very old computer

Training Session Excerpt 8: Miriam Opens her Presentation with a Call for “Dialogue”

(Excerpt taken from near the beginning of Training Session 10)

1 Miriam Well a- as a way to begin- uh (pause) I've
2 been doing a *lot* of reading on the
3 scholarship of teaching- an- so *some* of it
4 I'm going to talk with you about today. And
5 *most* important I would- I would like us to
6 have- dialogue. There are *some* things about
7 this s-s- straightforward and simple as it
8 is that I *grasp*- intellectually- and other
9 things that I *don't* grasp. So- some of those
10 things might come up this morning and uh I'd
11 love to have your responses (pause) uh to my
12 understanding or- *misunderstanding*

Training Session Excerpt 9: Ike Extols the Socratic Method

(Excerpt taken about 7 minutes into Miriam's presentation, Week 10)

13 Miriam Have you been *doing*- have you *done*
 14 scholarship of teach- should've asked this
 15 earlier

16 Ike Yeah- no- I have a *grant* to do this stuff

17 Miriam I'm sorry?

18 Ike I have a *grant* to do this stuff- and we

19 Miriam To do *scholarship*?

20 Ike Sure- and we also have th- the LA- the LA
 21 test ((data)) based on- evaluating-) uh- so
 22 I don't know if you know about that *project*
 23 but that- that's a big three year- three to
 24 *five* year project- it's got one and a half
 25 million dollars' funding and may have
 26 another million dollars coming in- and
 27 *that's* the validity of learning assistant
 28 program [Miriam: m-hm] So I don't know how
 29 many people have a learning assistant
 30 program, but that's getting majors into
 31 sciences to go into teaching

32 Miriam Uh-huh

33 Ike And uh- so part of *that* NSF grant is to
 34 evaluate whether those- those- those
 35 students have to take courses in pedagogy
 36 [Miriam: m-hm] (pause) as part of their uh
 37 *training*. And then we're trying to evaluate
 38 whether *one* day- they understand uh- how to
 39 do interactive engagement type of uh
 40 educational processes and to- and to *get*
 41 more Socratic. I- I actually don't believe
 42 there are *any*- advan- advances in education
 43 uh since uh- Socrates died

44 Miriam (laughing) *Thank* you
 45 (several in the group join Miriam with a
 46 laugh, and murmurs break out, as Ike quickly
 47 regains the floor over the murmuring)

48 Ike I mean- I mean- but- BUT it's- it's just
 49 been trying to accommodate [Miriam: yes] the

50 economic realities so [Miriam: yes] so Harry
51 Prinze in the College [Miriam: yes] of
52 Teaching is devising an instrument t- to
53 test whether- people who are *teaching*
54 understand and can do uh- interactive
55 engagement and ((pre-based)) pedagogy
56 [Miriam: yes] and then uh Sarah Doyle is-
57 part of that, doing work to see whether
58 teachers in K12 are actually doing it. . .

Training Session Excerpt 10: Miriam and Ike, in "Dialogue"?

(Excerpt taken midway through Miriam's presentation, Week 10)

59 Miriam . . . I- Abner has been there- I think Mark
60 has been there- Eve Bollig and Chloe (Julia
61 clears throat) are both uh- mentors and/or
62 coaches

63 Julia But all of those people do not know
64 education

65 Miriam No- they don't
66 (several voices escalating and overlapping,
67 some heard to be repeating "That's the
68 problem")

69 Ike That's a real issue, because all of a
70 sudden, people self-identify themselves and
71 they haven't- been trained

72 Miriam Okay, (upbeat tone) here's one piece of good
73 news- The funders insisted that we- assess-
74 formatively and summatively at- at the end
75 of our three year commitment- uh- what's
76 going on in this collaborative

77 Ike Good. How much money did they give you to do
78 the assessment?

79 Miriam NOTHING

80 Ike Well then they don't *mean* it.

81 Miriam Yes they DO mean it
82 (soft chuckle heard, as the conflict
83 escalates)

84 Ike No they DON'T mean it

85 Miriam Yes they DO

86 Ike 'Cuz if they wanted you to *do* it they'd give
87 you resources to *do* it.

88 Miriam I'm not coming out at the end of this [Ike
89 guffaws derisively: Ha ha ha ha ha ha ha]
90 three years from now and have ANYbody say to
91 me 'Wh- what did you learn Miriam?' and not
92 have a formal assessment available, 'cuz I'm
93 gonna say, 'here it is'

(skip about 90 seconds)

94 I have *heard*, Julia and Ike, what you're
95 saying [Ike laughs softly] and I find more
96 comfort in talking with you than- than not.
97 (pause) Okay- the- the- the- three- um
98 (pause) characteristics of- uh SOTL-
99 research- oh- I- I named all of them (pause)
100 so- so (pause) let me (pause) let me talk
101 just briefly then- Julia, in response to one
102 of your questions about what this means to
103 some of the faculty members in the
104 collaborative (pause) so here's what Sarah's
105 learning (pause) she's doing qualitative
106 research, she's doing surveys, and she's
107 doing interviews-

APPENDIX E: Interview Excerpts

Interview Excerpt 1: Ike, Professor (Part 1)

Ike presents his view of the defining nature of this training project

1 MZ How does it feel to participate in this?
 2 What is it like to be a *part* of such a
 3 thing? So that's my open-ended-

4 Ike Yeah, well it's weird. It- it *is* a weird
 5 thing because education is such a strange-
 6 uh area (pause) um- you know, I mean for-
 7 for me it's really (pause) it- it is really
 8 odd, because, really- deep down, I just
 9 don't believe in anything except sort of a
 10 one-on- almost one-on-one-ish, sort of do-
 11 it-yourself kinds of education, right? And
 12 where you learn and somebody talks to you,
 13 and then you learn yourself and somebody
 14 talks to you and whatever- or questions you-

15 I- so, whenever- this might be part of my
 16 own- neurosis but- you know- uh, you know
 17 *groups* make me nervous and- and they tend
 18 to- they tend to descend into to- to um
 19 (pause) more often than not posturing
 20 because- because real- you know real
 21 learning is actually quite threatening, in
 22 certain ways, right? I mean, you know, you
 23 have to be out there- you have to be
 24 engaged. Uh, that's why most people fade
 25 into the background if they can manage it.

26 Well because it's- you know, it's- and- and-
 27 people- you know everybody has their shtick,
 28 you know- and- and it's- it's *fun* when
 29 you're doing it. It's like one of those
 30 things where it's like weird to talk about
 31 it although it's actually very helpful to
 32 sort of become aware of what you're doing,
 33 because it's more efficient. You- you become
 34 aware of things and faster, more efficiently
 35 than you do when you are sort of *stumbling*

36 across these insights on your own. I mean-
 37 you know- part of it is because I come from
 38 a non- you know- I come from a sci- *science*
 39 background where nobody teaches you how to
 40 teach- ever. I mean like it's considered
 41 inappropriate to be taught how to teach,
 42 right?

43 MZ m-hmm

44 Ike I mean, in a weird way, right? And uh- it's
 45 *bizarre*. And you're used to- you know- where
 46 you *really* get taught almost all the time in
 47 any *really* meaningful way are *really* small
 48 settings, right? What lab- doing an
 49 experiment- sort of- you know- your *teacher*-
 50 or the *papers* you're reading- or when you're
 51 talking in a group- you know- you're
 52 *critiquing* something in a group- or
 53 something-

54 But I mean, it's- it's not as artificial
 55 even as the classroom, because you actually
 56 have a *reason* to read the paper. It's not
 57 like somebody *decided* that you should read
 58 the paper. It's 'cause you *want* to read the
 59 paper, because you *need* to read the paper-
 60 because the paper deals with what- you know-
 61 it's like the difference between active
 62 research and a *curriculum*, where somebody's
 63 *telling* you that you *should* know this and
 64 you *should* know that.

65 And because of my basic scientific
 66 skepticism- um- you know- where I *don't*
 67 believe people- in areas as simple-
 68 *relatively* simple as molecular biology, I
 69 don't think people know what they're talking
 70 about most of the time. So in- when people
 71 talk about what they think they're doing in
 72 *teaching* I'm even more suspect.

73 MZ Right.

74 Ike Well, I mean- you know- because- there's so
 75 many unknowns- it's so complex. It's so
 76 strange and it's so motivated by what the
 77 *student* wants and you know- what the
 78 pressures the *instructor's* under- uh- and

79 who *cares* what the outcome is and who
 80 *doesn't* care what the outcome is. I mean
 81 it's a very str- it's very strange- it's
 82 very strange at the moment and I- you know-
 83 I've been- I've been doing a lot-

84 MZ At the moment?

85 Ike It's *always* strange. Well I *have* been paying
 86 more attention to it recently. Before I just
 87 didn't care, right? I just did my *job*,
 88 right? Whatever the hell that was and- but
 89 now I'm more interested in education
 90 *research* and assessment stuff and so-

91 I'm thinking about trying to write a *popular*
 92 book about evolutionary biology, which-
 93 which is- which is different from all these-
 94 like- let's *bash* the creationist books or-
 95 or gee whiz isn't this just the coolest
 96 thing? But something more realistic-
 97 something *funny* and more realistic. But I-
 98 so I'm *thinking* about how people- you know,
 99 *what* is interesting- and (pause) how do
 100 people learn and what do they care about,
 101 you know, as opposed- the difference between
 102 lecturing and practice.

103 MZ So, the *group* discussion setting of our
 104 class- that's a little- that's not-

105 Ike It can be *okay* if people really start
 106 talking about what they *know*, right? I mean,
 107 when you get trickier is when you say- well,
 108 how do you know- I mean how *do* you know what
 109 students know? I mean how *do* you evaluate
 110 what's- a-ef- effective, right?

111 MZ You brought that up at- at the meeting-

112 Ike Well I mean- I- I mean- we're *building* a
 113 concept inventory in biology but you know,
 114 even that- every- *all* these things are
 115 flawed- they all have to be myopic in one
 116 way or the other. Uh- but how do you *know*
 117 that? And I- and I think there's a- there's
 118 a tendency to be- (pause) see I don't know-
 119 see- I don't know whether I'm being
 120 unrealistic (pause) in this- this idea of
 121 trying to go for some kind of scientific

- 122 rigor which I don't think is- may not- what-
123 may well not be possible.
- 124 MZ As measurement?
- 125 Ike As measurement- uh- and may not be possible
126 in the context because it's not like
127 everybody- I mean- it's like having an
128 agenda where every organism has a different
129 agenda right? I mean what one person *wants*
130 out of the class and what another person-
131 you know- wha- what a person *wants* and what
132 they get *out* of it- that's gonna be a
133 complex function. Now that's gonna interact
134 with how it's taught- [MZ: right] who's
135 teaching it and how it taught.
- 136 So you have this weird, very complicated
137 function that you don't know what the
138 *outcome* is gonna be. Y'know some people can
139 turn *on*. Some people can be turned *off*. Some
140 people can be turned off until you
141 intervene- you know- you know- can you
142 intervene? Under what context can you
143 intervene? You know- so- if it's a *big*
144 class-
- 145 MZ You mean the *teacher* intervenes?
- 146 Ike Yeah, if it's a big class your ability to
147 intervene with the *students* is not- is not
148 high.
- 149 MZ I know.

Interview Excerpt 2: Ike, Professor (Part 2)

Ike is asked directly about his reasons for participating in this training program

150 MZ So you're thinking in terms of goal
151 orientation and-

152 Ike It's always *outcomes*

153 MZ -more than a personal feeling about "I don't
154 feel honored by the- "they didn't *hear* me"-
155 or "someone cut me off"-

156 Ike No- I don't really care for them to listen
157 to me. I'm not there to- to be listened to.
158 That's not my goal in life.

159 MZ What was your motivation for joining up with
160 this project? It's a big- *time*- you know-
161 eater for everybody-

162 Ike Well- it's 'cause I'm just interested in
163 finding- I'm- I'm sort of trying to *learn*
164 about what people do when they do this so I
165 can get a real-time feel for what- what
166 *passes* for education sort of research.
167 'Cause I know these guys over in the College
168 of Ed, too, you know- so- so I know people
169 all over the place. So I'm- right now I'm
170 just trying to get a *feeling* for you know-
171 what *passes* for all these *things*, right? I
172 mean, I never saw the Kolb before. And the
173 Kolb's okay, right? Uh, and it makes sense
174 to me (pause)

175 Uh- the question becomes- well what- you
176 know, I'm not *that* interested in- you know-
177 the idea that *all* four quadrants are equally
178 valid- somebody would have to *prove* to me.
179 'kay? So I-

180 MZ Interesting.

181 Ike See what I mean?

182 MZ Yes I do.

183 Ike It's like- oh we're supposed to go around
184 this *thing*- well- you know- is that *true*? Is

185 that the way you really get real learning?
186 Or is that just the way you appeal to
187 people's- you know (pause) personalities.

188 MZ Hmmmm

189 Ike And I don't know whether that's known. See-
190 see- *that* would be the question *I* would ask.
191 Does it make- you know- which is- you know-
192 do you want- should you *force* people into a
193 certain axial structure- I know you don't
194 like that- nobody wants to be forc-

195 MZ I actually *do*- that's the thing-

196 Ike No- no- but you- I mean- should- I mean
197 are they all equivalent? (mocking tone) I
198 can't believe that's possible. I mean- you
199 look at the *world*. There are clearly people
200 who have different- different
201 effectivenesses in learning- different
202 effectivenesses in the ability to use
203 material. I mean- is it *possible* that there
204 are Kolb-defined styles that are totally
205 ineffective? And what you should be trying
206 to do is push people over? *Actively* push
207 people around? And foster that way of
208 thinking? Is- I mean- and- or is that a way
209 of thinking that only applies to a subset
210 of- you know- is that- is that a certain
211 type of academic scholar mindset? Or is- you
212 know- are there different mindsets for
213 different jobs? Right?

Interview Excerpt 3: Dom, Professor

Dom discusses his reasons for participating in this training program

- 1 Dom So you must be having a- having fun [MZ: I
2 am having a lot of fun] listening to idiots
3 like me in there- well I think I'm the only
4 idiot in there.
- 5 MZ Nah- I don't think there's any *idiots* in
6 there-
- 7 Dom ((I don't think there is)) but, y'know I'm
8 pretty nov- much of a novice when it comes
9 to this stuff
- 10 MZ The technology [Dom: Oh yeah] and different
11 things? Well I have a few questions [Dom:
12 sure!] since this is an open-ended interview
13 so we don't necessarily have to have all
14 these, but one for sure that can get us
15 going here- I won't hold you up past 1 if I
16 can help it. [Dom: Okay, yeah] Oh, you have
17 to go-
- 18 Dom I have a- an independent study. Jason will
19 be in here at 1 actually. (MZ: Oh, Jason?)
20 And there are two others, too-
- 21 MZ Okay. What was your motivation for joining
22 this group?
- 23 Dom Umm- *that* was very clear. Um- I wanted to
24 learn the *technology*. I wanted to learn- I
25 want to keep my- a- *teaching*- methods uh-
26 as- as current as they can be. And I think
27 the technology is the key to that. I want
28 to- um- I want to be able- m- y'know, it's-
29 it's interesting- somebody said it today
30 about the- what was it, the 70 percent is
31 communications and [MZ: yeah, on the video]
32 I fully agree with that. Now I'm- I'm- I'm
33 one of the rare ones in my department who
34 believes that- they believe it's all
35 content. But when I was chair of the
36 department I'd tell people who were having

37 trouble- ((assistants)) you can't
 38 communicate- you're brilliant- you're
 39 smarter than *I* am- I said, but I can go into
 40 a lecture and I can get the message across-
 41 and you ain't. I don't care how *smart* you
 42 are- if you can't *communicate*, whether it's
 43 jumping up and down, whether it's making
 44 them cry, whether it's- you- So I agree with
 45 that and I th- and I'm *wondering*- one of my
 46 motivations *beyond* trying to remain up to
 47 date and modern was a thought that are
 48 students learning differently? Now I've
 49 given Nora a very hard time about how much,
 50 as I've called it, educationese is in the
 51 class. And I'm not- I'm not really that
 52 interested in that. But I'm- but I *do*
 53 appreciate the fact that *maybe* when I get up
 54 in lecture, it's not like it was fifteen
 55 years ago. Maybe- maybe the *discipline* of
 56 students is different? Maybe they're *taught*-
 57 maybe they're coming through elementary,
 58 middle school and high schools differently?
 59 Not- typing on a computer- I see- I have a
 60 thirteen and a nine year old. My *nine-year*-
 61 old- shh- I- I- took- did you take *typing*
 62 in- typing class? I took a typing class in
 63 high school-

64 MZ It was a *horrible* experience, but I did
 65 (laughs)

66 Dom But I- and I- the typing- [MZ: typewriters!]
 67 but I had to take a typing class. My nine
 68 year old- chicka-chicka-chicka-chicka- they
 69 don't- So- Am I relating- I'm very concerned
 70 about relating to my students [MZ: Yeah, you
 71 are] beyond my sterling personality (laughs)
 72 which probably turns them off- [MZ: Bad]
 73 But, but, but am I projecting what I want to
 74 get out there to them? Are they observing
 75 it- I've noticed of course a proliferation
 76 of laptops in class. Now I believe that a
 77 lot of surfing the Net 'cause they're bored
 78 in class too. But- are they getting it? And-
 79 and being modern- you know- I- I know a *few*
 80 of my colleagues who do chat rooms and
 81 things like that- and I frankly didn't know

82 what it was. I just didn't- I've never *done*
83 it and- um- so I wanted to see what was out
84 there. Uh- this videoconferencing to me was
85 the first time I've ever seen
86 videoconference- it's the first time in my
87 life. I've never seen that.

Interview Excerpt 4: Julia, Graduate Assistant

Julia discusses her reasons for participating and characterizes her status (aka her “rank”) as a *student*-member of the training event

- 1 MZ So the reason (for her participation in the
2 program) is really you were asked [J: yes],
3 and he's [Dom] a good guy to work with, so
4 you said okay to that.
- 5 Julia Yes
- 6 MZ Did you know Nora already?
- 7 Julia Yes I've been working with Nora since
8 September. Um, so.
- 9 MZ So, like that. Okay. Here's the next
10 question. What I'm looking for, as I've said
11 once or twice to the group, is the way that
12 talk comes together with other talk, to
13 produce something new, and you could call
14 that dialogue [J: mm-hmm], okay? You think
15 there's something that would pop to head-
16 into your mind that you would- that you've
17 put on the table, that *turned* into
18 something? It was a comment that people
19 picked up on, and it contributed to
20 discussion- or started or built on
21 something. Just a memorable little
22 contribution that you've made-
- 23 Julia Well, just because it happened yesterday,
24 I'm thinking of when I said "You know, you
25 don't have to integrate all of the different
26 technology. You can *alt-tab* between two
27 applications pretty seamlessly in front of
28 your classroom." And then when Dom and Peg-
29 like I was just demonstrating on my
30 computer, um, so, *that* went somewhere.
- 31 MZ That *did* go somewhere, didn't it? [J: so]
32 That must've felt kinda good.
- 33 Julia It was good, I went back and told my

34 officemate that I was talking about him in
 35 class (laughs loudly for a second or two,
 36 while speaking)- just because- I don't
 37 know- it's fun to tell him that. But- yeah.
 38 Yeah. So that felt good. Because I was like-
 39 I- In technology- getting technology into
 40 the classroom, it's so intimidating, and
 41 it's also so cool. Like I don't remember who
 42 was presenting to us- about like, it's cool
 43 and it's- all the C's- I don't remember. Um.
 44 But putting technology into the classroom
 45 because it's cool or convenient is not the-
 46 necessarily the reason to do it, and I-

47 MZ Maybe that was Joy-

48 Julia Yeah, might've been Joy, yeah. And, I was
 49 just- I wanted to *show* these- these
 50 professors who may not be hugely tech savvy,
 51 that, you know, there are a lot of, like
 52 really sophisticated programs out there-
 53 that you can like do *everything* at once or
 54 whatever. But you can also just use a
 55 handful of things- and if you're fluid with
 56 your computer, it's- it can be just as
 57 seamless. And so that was- I like don't want
 58 them to be *overwhelmed* by the- by the
 59 issues.

60 MZ I hope there'll be a chance to *really*
 61 demonstrate that. It just hits me right now
 62 that you say- and you re- remind me of how
 63 important that is. And- plus I have- I'm
 64 also a faculty member that needs to learn to
 65 use technology [J: mmm-hmm] like everybody.
 66 [J: right] There's no "I know it all now."
 67 [J: right] It *changes* constantly. [J: no]
 68 You can *never* [J: exactly] know it all. [J:
 69 exactly] But I wonder- I would just love,
 70 based on what I've seen of our faculty and
 71 things they've asked, if someone were up
 72 there and just *demonstrated*- clicking in-
 73 just opening up three or four apps, running
 74 them through, jumping across seamlessly- to
 75 see that, to go with the idea that you put
 76 on the table there, then it- I think it
 77 would be "ooh, I can do that." [J: Yeah] But
 78 that's uh- you know, to see it live- you

79 gotta see that.

80 Julia Yeah. I think so too. I actually- just- I
81 have *two* people at the school of education,
82 who I think- or I guess *three* people, who I
83 think *really* bring technology into the
84 classroom very *effectively*. Um, and I *wish*
85 that we could all observe them. You know,
86 that'd be really cool. But I don't really
87 know (pause) I don't know how it would *work*-
88 like taking all of *us* into a classroom
89 that's already 30 people large, would be
90 probably overwhelming for the professor,
91 distracting for the students. I do have one-
92 one professor is uh, teaching in a couple
93 different statistics courses, but he found
94 some software that records the *audio* in the
95 classroom, but also records *everything* that
96 he does on the screen. [MZ: hmmm!] So it
97 shows the *mouse* moving, it shows like [MZ:
98 wow!] so he- he has recorded his- his- his
99 *lectures*, and he can take his 2 ½ hour
100 lecture and literally take it and put it on
101 the Web, and you can *listen* to *him* talk,
102 while the computer screen's changing [MZ
103 taps pen on table excitedly], and you can
104 listen to the student questions that arise
105 and how he answers them and what he *does* to
106 answer them on the computer screen [MZ: oh
107 my goodness] as well as what he says. I told
108 him- I was like, "You need to do stats- ed
109 research with this," because that is *right*
110 *there*- that- that little package is an
111 incredible *amount* of data, but also, um,
112 without having a *video* recorder, it's really
113 capturing a piece of the class that you
114 can't see otherwise. [MZ: yeaaaah] And uh
115 [MZ: fascinating], I mean, I thought it was
116 really cool and I was just like, so- you
117 know, I might be able to convince *him* to let
118 me bring in, you know, 30 minutes of him
119 using technology in the classroom?, but,
120 [pause] you know, I'm [pause]

121 MZ How 'bout if we saw some of that- what-
122 that- cast-

123 Julia That software?

124 MZ I mean, if it's- it's on the Web-

125 Julia Yeah- I'll have to ask him if he has it on
126 the Web. And I *think* he does. I think he
127 shares it with his students-

128 MZ Or *wherever* he has it- he's got it
129 *somewhere*- it's saved in his files-

130 Julia Of course- it's somewhere. So if he could
131 share one of the files-

132 MZ If we saw 10 minutes of it-[Julia: yeah] as
133 a little demo, and see- watch how this
134 person- not only would we see the demo of
135 that software [Julia: right], we'd see how a
136 person [Julia: yeah] how they do what they
137 do [Julia: yeah], since he's *good* at it.

138 Julia Yeah. [MZ: hmmm]Yeah. I think he's good at
139 it. And he's good at moving between the
140 board and the computer, too, but, then we
141 wouldn't get that from *this*, but [MZ: hmmm!]
142 but it *would* show the computer technology
143 piece. I have to think about that. [MZ: m-
144 hmm] Well I'll talk to- I'll talk to Ted and
145 see if he'd be willing to share it.

146 MZ How 'bout if you thought back- see, that was
147 very recent, and I would agree [Julia: m-
148 hmm] quite a- a key contribution as far as
149 how people are taking all this [Julia: m-
150 hmm, m-hmm]. What's something *else* that you
151 remember throwing out there, that just
152 seemed to *stick* a little?

153 Julia (whispered softly, as to herself) What did
154 stick? (pause)

155 MZ You know what I mean by that? I mean uh-
156 people heard you.

157 Julia Yeah. I know what you *mean* by that, and I'm
158 just trying to *think* back [MZ: okay] umm [6
159 second pause] Mmm [4 second pause] Nothing's
160 coming to mind. But- my brain's a little
161 fuzzy [MZ: okay] I've got comps next week,
162 so it's [MZ: you *do*?!] like, my brain is
163 like (sticks out her tongue and makes a
164 quick 'poop' sound, then starts laughing
165 loudly)

166 MZ Hmmm. Well good luck!

167 Julia So thanks [laughs] But I'm- [pause]

168 MZ Are you ready?

169 Julia Yeah. As ready as I'll ever be. [laughs
170 loudly]

171 MZ That's a good attitude! I *never* hear people
172 say that! [Julia: no] It's like "I don't
173 know, I don't know, I don't-

174 Julia Yeah- well, we'll see [laughs loudly]

175 MZ Good for you. That's how *I* hope to go in
176 [Julia: yeah] I say, you know at this point
177 [Julia: right] We know what I'm supposed to
178 know. Let me do my best to *answer* it.

179 Julia Right, right.

180 MZ Okay, *I* remember one [Julia: okay] I mean, a
181 *discussion* that you were part of, 'cause I
182 just was watching the video. [Julia: yeah]
183 The *politeness* of e-mails? [Julia: uh-huh]
184 *Everyone* was engaged in that [Julia: yeah]
185 little chat. [Julia: yeah] Did you remember
186 having a perspective you threw out there? If
187 not, that's fine, and we'll jus-

188 Julia No

189 MZ Not really? [pause] Emoticons? Nah?

190 Julia Yeah, we *talked* about- a *little* bit about
191 emoticons, using smiling faces, and I- I
192 might've been the one who said, "and smiley
193 faces punctuating your- stuff"- I might've
194 said that- I can *imagine* saying that 'cause
195 I am a smiley face user, so-

196 MZ You are? Okay. Well let me ask you *this*
197 then. Do you recall ever, putting a thought
198 out there, and it didn't seem to take? And
199 maybe you didn't even get heard. *That* kind
200 of a feeling, in contrast.

201 Julia Yeah, but I can't think of a specific
202 instance of it. I feel like I *do* say things
203 and then it- either it doesn't stick- it's
204 not- people can't relate to it at all, or
205 it's not relevant. Or it doesn't *seem*

206 relevant to, where the discussion's going.
 207 Man, I wish I could be more specific for
 208 you.

209 MZ You don't have to be, 'cause just feelings
 210 and impressions are [Julia: yeah] fine, too,
 211 for what I'm asking here. [Julia: yeah] So
 212 maybe you'll tell me a little more about the
 213 feeling of saying stuff- and it doesn't seem
 214 to take. That kind of thing.

215 Julia Well, you know, I'm a PhD student, so I'm
 216 getting *used* to that. [laughs] I mean, it
 217 seems to happen a *lot*, like where you're in
 218 a group of academics, uh- everybody's in it-
 219 we're very focused in this group on our *own*-
 220 like how *I'm* gonna use the technology in *my*
 221 class. It seems very very very individual.
 222 And so I feel like we're *still* not to the
 223 point, even this week, that we're ready to
 224 be contributing to other people's concerns.
 225 [MZ: hmmm] Like we *all* talk and we all, you
 226 know, talk about our *opinions*, and we talk
 227 about that kind of stuff, but I've yet to
 228 see- like- one person say well, you know,
 229 "this might work for *you*." You know, it's
 230 always "how is this going to work for *me*?"
 231 Do y- I mean- I'm not sure if that's [pause]
 232 if that's necessarily *true*, and I'm not sure
 233 how- if that's how everybody *else* would f-
 234 feel if you asked them the same question
 235 [MZ: m-hm] But, um, that's kind of how I'm
 236 seeing it [MZ: okay] No one's say- like
 237 [pause] none of- I don't see that coming
 238 from the professors. I don't see [pause] Ike
 239 telling Dom, "Have you thought about doing
 240 *this* in your history course?" I mean- we *all*
 241 have ideas about history. We all have ideas
 242 about journalism. We all have ideas about
 243 biology. But I don't see [pause] any [pause]
 244 cross. Um-

245 MZ Not yet, anyway. [Julia: no, not yet] I mean
 246 that still could happen- you never know -

247 Julia Oh it's still early in the semester and um,
 248 we're still getting to know each other, were
 249 still- I mean we're still hashing out our

250 own objectives. So- and I think it's
 251 appropriate that we're so focused on
 252 ourselves. Um- but- I don't know that- maybe
 253 that just might be who I am. I like to- I
 254 like to- I *really* like to engage with other
 255 people's issues. [MZ: m-hmmm] Like, I *really*
 256 like to help other people or feel like I'm
 257 helping other people or pushing other
 258 people. And so maybe I'm just- being
 259 hypersensitive to [pause] the *lack* of that
 260 from *everybody*.

261 MZ M-hmm. M-hmm. And you were saying, as a PhD
 262 student in a room with- have faculty, do you
 263 think that's pretty much uh- the expected uh
 264 play-out of a discussion?

265 Julia You know, it's been hit or miss for me. *Some*
 266 people who have their Ph.Ds, who are faculty
 267 members or researchers or something, are
 268 very- like they see value that graduate
 269 students are bringing in their experiences
 270 and their ideas and stuff as something
 271 that's value added. And then there are other
 272 professors who- really- don't expect
 273 anything- s- anything *substantive* from you
 274 because you're just a PhD student. And it
 275 doesn't matter if you're older than the
 276 professor and have more experience in- in
 277 whatever you're talking about. It- really-

278 MZ That *rank* system.

279 Julia Yeah. It's just the *rank*. It's- it's just
 280 not there. So- um- I'm not sure if that's
 281 really [pause] th- the issue right now in
 282 this class, though. I don't feel it being
 283 terribly rank [MZ: m-hm] ordered, in terms
 284 of who can talk and who can be listened to
 285 and stuff like that.

286 MZ That's a point. I think I would agree with
 287 that.

288 Julia Yeah, I don't- I don't- I don't feel like
 289 anybody says, "Oh *Julia* doesn't know what
 290 she's talking about. You know, I'm not
 291 gonna- I don't think anybody spaces out
 292 while I'm talking because I'm a student. You

293 know, um, I still think that it's probably
294 just everyone's focused on *their* course that
295 they're trying to redesign. [MZ: m-hm] So
296 [MZ: mmm] That's my impression.

APPENDIX F: Example of a Complete Interview: Peg, Professor

((Begin Interview)):

- 1 MZ I won't take up too much time talking about what
 2 *isn't* our project, but what I'm doing *is* right
 3 now our project -- ours. I'm in a methods class,
 4 in Qualitative Research Methods [uh-huh] in
 5 Communication. Things are really changing in
 6 research methods in communication, which I say,
 7 because I got my masters in the late '80s at the
 8 University of Maryland, and I had a similar kind
 9 of methods classes, and boy it's remarkable how
 10 the field has evolved. [uh-huh] What's
 11 interesting now to scholars, that was just being
 12 talked about then.
- 13 Peg Like what's an example?
- 14 MZ Here's an example: the idea of qualitative
 15 research now, and my professor Bryan Taylor--I
 16 don't know if you know him--he's a co-author of
 17 our book, which is quite a prominent book in our
 18 field. So he's an authority, clearly, in all of
 19 this, and it's taken what we would call an
 20 interpretive turn. [uh-huh] Meaning more openness
 21 [m-hmm] and attention to than nuances of
 22 experience and sense-making, as opposed to
 23 possibly more formalized [I see] content-driven
 24 things. So the fact that were here, and that
 25 there's some ambient noises that would in the
 26 older school, uh, be *noise* [uh-huh] we would
 27 introduce that as noise, and an issue and a
 28 problem. Whereas here, it adds to how we do what
 29 we are doing and is seen it as a good thing,
 30 possibly. It would be something that I would
 31 describe as I write up.
- 32 Peg We are relaxed. We are in a café.
- 33 MZ In a café on the Hill, music, things outside,
 34 that kind of thing. My purpose of my interview
 35 here is to find out from you one-on-one about how
 36 you are experiencing this group activity. My
 37 project, in terms of the work I'm doing is to
 38 find out and personally nail down, if I can,
 39 ideas about dialogue. My theory -- which I am
 40 not shy about proclaiming, although no one is

thrilled to hear about it either without being substantiated, you know, with some rigor [uh-huh] and some scholarship, but at least I do have one. And that's fun. I've been working with this literature for a while -- is that we are missing the *product* aspect of dialogue, as we theorize about what it means as a communication entity. We need to know about the process, the modern view is that it's only a momentary thing. We could talk for two hours, and maybe never attain it or possibly if things work, we would have a magic moment, where we are overlapping our realities so closely we are just so open to one another. That's what's pretty much the state of the present literature, and I'm trying to say that that's one way to look at this, but I'm looking more at what gets produced. [m-hmm] So that's what I'm *really* doing. And right now as an interviewer, I'm just, you know, trying to look one-on-one with somebody at what is the experience of this group d- discussion environment that you are part of and that I'm taping and looking at. So, I have made a fairly specific set of interviewing topics and sub questions. [Peg: okay] But true to qualitative methods, I won't just ask all of these. I'm going to be guided by and peek at them now and then and say, are we covering all this. Is there anything we really haven't talked about [okay] that I need. I have about five questions and then one last general one to end with. So let me start with this number one, which I've been dying to ask for a while of you and that is, how did you get -- uh, bad way to word it -- see how that steers? That's leading the witness. (both laugh) I want to get my wording right. How is it that you came to join this project?

Peg Okay. Mmm, I may not remember all of the how- but what I remember is that I've known Nora, a little bit, but I haven't known her very well. Um, over the years we've been on campus together, she's helped me with the graduate teacher assignments that I've made and so forth. But in December, we both were at a conference together, and it was in DC. And we spent a lot of time together, had a

86 great time, went to dinner. We just, you know, we
87 got to know each other. And I'm pretty sure it
88 must have been in the context of some of those
89 conversations that she mentioned this project and
90 said "Do you wanna take a part in it?" or
91 something like that and I actually don't remember
92 anything specific, other than, I think that's
93 what happened. And then I think December ended
94 with the usual craziness of graduation, and this
95 and that, and at some point, I think there was an
96 e-mail from Nora, where she said "Do you remember
97 when you said you'd want to be in this?" And I
98 thought what, what is it that I said, and so I
99 just kind of said, "oh yeah, remind me," and she
100 said "oh, okay." So that's how. It was- the short
101 answer is through a connection to Nora.

102 MZ Okay. That's an interesting development. (pause)
103 Did you know any of the other participants,
104 before we sat down and started this?

105 Peg You mean, the other two professors, or everybody?

106 MZ Anybody or everybody.

107 Peg Well, I know the people who were on the
108 journalism side. And so, you know, Morningstar
109 is there because I invited her to be the- my grad
110 assistant. Stan, because he's our school's
111 designated technology assistant, as person was in
112 it from the start, I guess was in it, as long as
113 any journalism professor was in it, he was going
114 to be in it. Uh, I think that's it- I didn't know
115 the other two professors or the other grad
116 students.

117 MZ Okay (pause) what did you know about the purpose
118 of this?

119 Peg Well, not that much- but the word technology was
120 in there, and I think it was in my mind, you
121 know, you'll learn how to use more technologies
122 and apply them to your classes.

123 MZ Okay, did you have personal motivations to learn
124 that, so that this could be a goal of yours that
125 I'll not only help with the project but I want to
126 learn those kinds of things?

127 Peg You know, I'm in the journalism school, and so

128 it's kind of like you're saying, oh the methods
129 class from the '80s to now is really changing,
130 well I mean, the journalism field is really
131 changing dramatically, and some things kind of
132 remain, for example, if you're teaching students
133 how to write or how to do an interview or how to
134 um, you know, take content and deliver it to an
135 audience. There are some things that stay the
136 same. But all that stuff that we had demonstrated
137 on Wednesday. All that was not, in any way, part
138 of a newsroom, when I was an intern, and now it's
139 all part of a newsroom. So yes, the motivation on
140 the part of any journalism teacher to be more
141 adept to learn more and all of that- is- it
142 should be- very motivating.

143 MZ And for you it is?

144 Peg I mean I'm looking at all this stuff and
145 thinking. I can use some of this. I could have
146 them take some video image is with their stories
147 I could have them do this. I could have them do
148 all of that.

149 MZ That was really fun, Wednesday wasn't it, to see
150 all that happen. I enjoyed that. I- I'm
151 benefiting to, because not only am I having a
152 site to do research, but I'm learning all of this
153 as you are and it's really fun as a longtime
154 teacher. I appreciate the upgrade myself. So
155 that's kind of fun. Did you have any social or
156 other kinds of reasons for joining: I'll meet
157 some new people. That kind of a motivation.

158 Peg No.

159 MZ Not really?

160 Peg Not really. I mean, my time is- I like to meet
161 new people, but I wouldn't, I'm taking French
162 class. And *that* I'm doing for kind of social and
163 personal, emotional reasons. It's a lot of fun, I
164 meet some new people. Maybe this maybe that, but
165 no, not technology class (laughs) no, not really.

166 MZ Not for you. Did you appreciate when you signed
167 on and get started here the time commitment there
168 would be

169 Peg I didn't.

170 MZ And how are you doing with that?

171 Peg I'm doing okay. I'm in a no-teaching semester,
 172 which makes it far more doable than- so, you
 173 know, like everything, you think, "Oh that's not
 174 so bad, two hours on Wednesday mornings," until
 175 Wednesday morning arrives and you're kind of
 176 thinking- gosh, I really should be doing- so, um,
 177 I mean, it's fine. It's- I don't know we could
 178 have a smaller meeting or a shorter meeting and
 179 get much out of it- so you know it's okay - it's
 180 definitely something I think about, is this a
 181 good use of my time. Plus I've got Morningstar in
 182 there plus Stan.

183 MZ Hmmm. Okay, that gives me a sense of how you came
 184 into this. My next question is, how would you
 185 compare this group, in a way that would
 186 distinguish it or define it, I'm saying, in a way
 187 that sets it apart from other workgroups that
 188 you've participated in? What makes this a
 189 different group and other ones?

190 Peg Um, I guess it's been unusual in that it kind of
 191 functions like a class -- with class time in a
 192 classroom. We kind of have a teacher, who's Nora
 193 and maybe Martin, but really it's Nora and um
 194 thank God we're not getting grades, and then, uh,
 195 in an odd way, the students are professors, and
 196 their helpers are really their teachers, and you
 197 know, like Stan, is there kind of quote-unquote
 198 to, you know, help me with whatever it is I need,
 199 but in fact, he's the teacher. You know -- so
 200 it's different in that way. In all those ways, I
 201 think it's not, not a typical-

202 MZ It sounds like you- pardon me- it sounds like you
 203 you're saying that roles-

204 Peg Yeah, maybe roles are different, yeah, yeah.

205 MZ Hmm, what have you noticed about the *dynamics* of
 206 this group of people as sessions unfold?

207 Peg Well, ummm -- in a very- so here you've got a
 208 group that's a typical and yet, I think a lot of
 209 the dynamics are classroom-typical so like you
 210 want to be respectful of the teacher, and, you
 211 know, be agreeable with whatever's on the agenda
 212 for the day and um, you know, be in the

213 participating student mode, and, um, what was
 214 your question?

215 MZ The dynamics of the group?

216 Peg Oh, the dynamics. So I think- I think it's
 217 interesting that the dynamics that *I* see playing
 218 out, or maybe I'm just talking about myself, but
 219 I think Dom was kind of indicating the same thing
 220 -- we chatted for a second -- um, that, you know,
 221 it is a very traditionally -- at an operational
 222 level, it's very traditional.

223 MZ The group dynamics. This is a traditional model.

224 Peg Not a traditional model, but it's working out in
 225 a traditional way, in that- I think that Ike is a
 226 bit of an exception. He's kind of more out there
 227 saying, you know, "I think this and I think that"
 228 and just jumping in. And I think I'm more like
 229 sitting there thinking, okay, I'm supposed to be
 230 listening, and so I'll listen. And I think Dom is
 231 also saying you know, okay, I'm here to listen.
 232 And so I'm listening. Even though I maybe have
 233 something to say, I'm not going to be, you know,
 234 so disruptive as to say, why are we doing this?

235 MZ Hmmmm. That's interesting.

236 Peg I mean (pause) it's a bit of a confrontational
 237 question. If a student in my class says to me,
 238 "Why are we doing this? I don't see why we're
 239 doing this." So in that sense, you know it's- I
 240 wouldn't- I don't find it all that easy to think
 241 about *challenging*, how the class is put together
 242 and coming together. My- my one moment was -- and
 243 it really was kind of starting with me and Dom
 244 kind of at the back of the room (()) don't know
 245 exactly when it was, but I think you taped this,
 246 Nora and I afterwards went -- okay, so it was
 247 that day -- and so it was that day where, in my
 248 mind, this thing you asked about earlier, I'm
 249 here every two- every Wednesday for two hours,
 250 and that's a lot of time and- and I guess it's
 251 not so much the issue of time, but time for *what*?
 252 So if it feels like, okay that's two hours, and
 253 I'm learning so much stuff, it's worth it a
 254 hundredfold -- that's one thing. [Right] Or I'm
 255 here for two hours and really I'm not getting to

256 any of the stuff that I thought I was here for
257 [m-hmm], then that's a whole different equation,
258 and it feels like, oh this is this huge waste of
259 my time, I'm not (enjoying) this. So I was kind
260 of moving in- it's a huge waste of my *time* to be
261 here. Not 'cause it isn't interesting, it's
262 interesting. But I don't care about learning
263 styles. I really don't. Umm, you know, I know
264 Nora knows it inside out, and- and you know
265 probably would never admit me to uh, whatever
266 candidacy or something if she were in that role
267 with me, but um you know, I was there for the
268 technology piece. And when I started feeling
269 like, we're running out of time were not going to
270 get to the technology piece. So I was sitting
271 there in the back with Dom and (pause) I must
272 have made some kind of comment to him or he made
273 a comment to me about, you know, why are we doing
274 this kind of thing, instead of some *other* kind of
275 thing, which is more- and Dom said that "I very
276 bluntly put that in the crosstalk in one of the
277 Monday morning, Monday noon sessions that
278 previous Monday"-

279 MZ You had- uh, Dom had said that-

280 Peg Dom said to me, "I said that in my e-mail on
281 Monday." And I felt like, and he s- he was
282 expressing the very same thing I'm saying to you.
283 And I felt like, oh, I hope this isn't too blunt,
284 but I said, you know in the e-mail- and so I
285 never saw that e-mail, I didn't go back and look
286 it up, but he kind of gave me a little bit of
287 (pause) confirmation that it was okay to feel
288 this way.

289 MZ Oh.

290 Peg So, I can't remember what exactly I said in the
291 open session. I- I really don't remember if I
292 said much. But then I *do* remember that I went
293 afterwards and sat down with Nora to say a *few*
294 things, and I *think*, what we said, what I said,
295 had to do with, "Hey, I- I'm really hoping- you
296 know, not that I'm not interested in Kolb, and I
297 understand its value and all that, but I'm not
298 here to learn about Kolb, and if you had invited
299 me to learn about Kolb, I would've said no. So

300 I'm *really* wanting to learn about technology, and
301 *then*, I mean, she really responded, I mean notes
302 started showing up and Martin started writing,
303 and we're going to do this and we're going to do
304 that in whatever. And it just seemed like, oh,
305 wow, she's really changing some stuff -- or maybe
306 it would've been that way all along. It just
307 seemed like-

308 MZ I don't know about that-

309 Peg You know, so anyway.

310 MZ I was really impressed with Nora, [yeah] just
311 made a big change [yeah] not every leader is
312 prepared to take the input

313 Peg She just like did a turn and then said "okay were
314 doing this, and we're doing that"

315 MZ Was it hard to approach her and make that
316 comment?

317 Peg Well, as I say, I have this kind of *history* with
318 her. It's not a *huge* history, but it's a very
319 friendly history, I mean, I really like her a
320 lot. She gave me the recipes that I cooked for
321 uh, my New Year's Eve party, and they were
322 fabulous. Uh, and then I just asked her if she
323 had Chinese recipes. And she just gave me a
324 whole folder with these great Chinese recipes. So
325 I would- I would rather sit there and suffer,
326 then do something that you know, kind of makes an
327 *irreparable* break in you know our relationship.
328 But I felt like you know maybe I could say what I
329 had to say and not be, critical about it and just
330 you know try to say, this is kind of what I'm
331 feeling and what do you think. And so, whatever,
332 I mean, I tried to be pleasant and (pause)
333 respectful.

334 MZ Did you get a sense that she was open to hearing
335 [uh] this kind of commentary?

336 Peg Oh, I couldn't tell right at the moment, but
337 certainly within you know the next day or two,
338 with all of the we're doing this, we're doing
339 this-- I'm like oh, okay, great. So.

340 MZ That seemed to be a very important moment so far
341 [Meg laughs] in this project.

342 Peg (laughs) Well, it seemed to be for me.

343 MZ For what it's worth, it is something everyone has
 344 brought up in the interviews. [Oh!] It's a common
 345 theme, which is one of the things I'm being
 346 trained to listen for [uh-huh] -- what are the
 347 common themes? [uh-huh] What are the common- So
 348 just to give you that feedback, it-

349 Peg You mean that that there- they were all feeling
 350 we want to do more technology?

351 MZ Not- well, I- I think that's probably true but
 352 some folks haven't it said it that way, but when
 353 I asked some these questions in how the dynamics-
 354 how are things are going. [oh?] How is it
 355 unfolding [uh-huh]. What about roles? There would
 356 be always it's been mentioned, well, since Peg
 357 [oh okay!] brought that up, things have changed
 358 [yeah, yeah]. To me, as a participant in a group
 359 I would just love that. I would love to know
 360 something [oh, no, no] I did as [yeah, yeah]

361 Peg I'm happy and I hope she's happy.

362 ((along with constant clattering of cups and off-
 363 and-on whirring of coffee machines,
 364 "progressive/world"-type music has been playing
 365 in the background throughout the interview. Right
 366 now, the strains of Santana (?) seems especially
 367 noticeable, as other conversational hum has for
 368 the moment quieted))

369 MZ Yeah. Let's see. Do you think that the people,
 370 the group communication is especially
 371 collaborative?

372 Peg No.

373 MZ No -- why not? Or how so, if-

374 Peg Well, uh, I think there's all kinds of you know
 375 levels and levels and levels, and maybe it could
 376 get to be collaborative um, but- um, now, we have
 377 to stop for a second. And I have to understand
 378 where this is used and how it's used and when I
 379 can kind of go completely off the record.

380 MZ Okay -- Well, I can turn the tape recorder off
 381 [okay!] if that would help.

382 Peg That will help.

383 MZ And then- then- I- I will do that right now.

384 Peg And then, I mean, I'm going to say this, but,
 385 it's-its got to be like *background* for you 'cause
 386 I'm just not a- available to say it in any other
 387 way. But I mean 'cause you asked a specific
 388 question.[Yeah] ((short phrase omitted here since
 389 she had thought the recorder was off))-

390 MZ I didn't turn that off yet!

391 Peg Turn it off! (big laugh)

392 MZ But I- I was almost going to say, just for- in
 393 terms of method [okay] if there's a way to answer
 394 that you're comfortable with [okay] then I can-

395 Peg All right, so I don't think, uh - okay, so I can
 396 and then let's do it this way then. Yeah, I
 397 don't think it's great in terms of collaboration,
 398 because um (pause) because maybe because there
 399 are different levels of ability. That's *one*
 400 thing. Um, so [ability] I mean I put myself at
 401 the bottom. Like okay I know nothing [technical
 402 ability] And uh, it's not *literally* true that I
 403 know nothing. But I mean I don't, you know, put
 404 myself up there above someone else --I've done
 405 this I've done that. And um, and so I have this
 406 sense for example, that Ike is very much more
 407 skilled. But in- *and* I kind of feel like um
 408 there's a certain impatience about, you know,
 409 maybe *questions* that aren't uh at the level of
 410 somebody else in the past, like him, or something
 411 like that. And um, so I just feel like you know
 412 I'm not that (pause) *free* to ask questions. Or I
 413 just feel like okay-

414 MZ That's what I need to hear. Yeah. You're not
 415 personalizing anybody. I'm just communicating a
 416 feel about moods, because I'm looking at how talk
 417 turns into talk [uh-huh] and if- whether things
 418 are free, and feeling that way or not is really
 419 [yeah] central to where I'm coming [yeah] from.

420 Peg Yeah. So I think I could be free one-to-one, with
 421 almost anybody around the table, like free to say
 422 something to Nora, one-to-one, free to say
 423 anything to Stan, Morningstar, Dom, um, you --
 424 you know, like can I see your recorder, and uh,
 425 Martin certainly. I mean, you know, he's very

426 patient, about explaining how things are and all
 427 that. So in *that* sense, I think yes, but then, it
 428 doesn't somehow translate to the whole group
 429 dynamic of the class.

430 MZ Okay

431 Peg And I mean, if you can point to me in your
 432 recordings, where it is- maybe there are moments
 433 of it, but it's- it's m- small, [m-hmm] you know.
 434 [M-hmm] And- and I think there is a, and- and
 435 it's an interesting um (pause) commentary on the
 436 class, which is- again, I would say using very
 437 traditional methods to do a kind of *untraditional*
 438 thing, to teach your students and look at new
 439 media and stuff like that. So, you know, if I
 440 were asked by Nora or Martin or anybody, you
 441 know, how would you- if you did it again, what do
 442 you think should be *different*, I'd say, you know,
 443 I don't think there should be so much kind of
 444 lecture at the front, and we're sitting there
 445 being the recipients and um in the same way that
 446 we have, you know, like I don't know if you're
 447 teaching History 101 or COMM 101 or something - I
 448 know there are students, when I say things, who
 449 are sitting there thinking, "What is she talking
 450 about?" But they're not raising their hands,
 451 saying "I don't know what you're talking about."
 452 So I think we have *that* exact same dynamic for
 453 the same reasons [m-hmm]. People up front know
 454 what's going on. People in the back are there
 455 because they don't really know that much about
 456 what's going on. So there's, you know- so for me
 457 -- and I don't know about the others -- but for
 458 me, I think a class- we can all be in the same
 459 room. But like just nobody presenting at the
 460 front. Or somebody presenting for three minutes
 461 at the front saying, "Okay. You work with Stan.
 462 You work with your person and go to the blog dot
 463 com and create your blog, and in 15 minutes,
 464 we're going to pop all of them on the screen and
 465 see what you created, you created, and you
 466 created." So, *that* I think with all this stuff.
 467 Here's a cellphone take a picture with it where
 468 I- and so this is the learning style. And maybe,
 469 I don't know what learning style I'm using- we're
 470 using, but that's the one I think would work. For

471 me.

472 MZ Okay. I'll share this with you and this is
473 interesting since you are a journalism guru of
474 sorts -- more than of sorts -- but I have college
475 and semi-professional journalism background, and
476 I have made some comments in our class, as we
477 talk about interviewing, that reflects my
478 journalism training, and one of the things I said
479 in our last class is that it's risky to take
480 comments off the record. Especially in a
481 journalism- I'm not a journalist right now, [uh-
482 huh, uh-huh] I'm here as a researcher [yeah],
483 because you never know what you'll be told [uh-
484 huh], and th- then you can't do anything with it
485 [right, right] without harming integrity. But
486 here's something, Peg, and again it's my subject
487 position, as postmoderns [uh-huh] say that's a
488 little different from some of my peers [uh-huh],
489 but I've also been making quite a stand in our
490 group. Not necessarily a popular one, but a loud
491 one anyway, that the researcher's end product
492 should be easy to appreciate by those researched
493 [m-hmm]. And you can imagine it's similar to
494 writing, let's say, a bio piece on somebody.
495 Maybe you would take the other side of this, but
496 it's the side I'm playing right now that you
497 wouldn't want to write this and have them furious
498 I can't [oh!] believe you said all this [uh-huh!]
499 and that there's a school of thought that says
500 that says, well, that's just one of- [that's the
501 way it goes]- but I'm taking the *counter* approach
502 to that of, if you look harder [uh-huh] and do
503 more thinking [uh-huh] you can see wonderful
504 stuff also [uh-huh] that wouldn't necessarily be
505 an issue of anybody's [uh-huh] So when you
506 wonder, you know, what will I do with some things
507 that you say, or for that matter, everything that
508 I'm taping, it's important to me, just to prove
509 my point [I see] to this group that you can study
510 human beings without anybody [oh] having to look
511 bad [uh huh] -- just look at, for example, you
512 just emulated that, which is why I'm articulating
513 [uh huh] this to you [uh huh]. You just did such
514 a nice job of saying, wait a minute--okay, if you
515 have to leave that on [uh huh], another way to

516 say that this [yeah] is [yeah, yeah] we don't
 517 have to personalize it all [yeah, yeah] and we've
 518 gotten, actually we just got at something really
 519 neat. [okay]. So that's just where I'm coming
 520 from [that's good] so you wouldn't have to worry
 521 that I'm going to write something that says, she
 522 actually said [yeah, yeah] that kind of thing.
 523 That's just my style [okay] It's also political I
 524 think, 'cause you know as I've grown, I've
 525 learned you have to deal with these people. It's
 526 not like you write your paper, and everything's
 527 done. You know, I'd actually love for you someday
 528 to maybe see what I did and say, MZ, that's good
 529 -- you did some good things there. [yeah, yeah]
 530 Anyway, that's just my little uh, thing, there.
 531 (pause) What do you think -- well, this- we kind
 532 of answered this already, unless you have a
 533 different uh, a different uh a different answer,
 534 but my standard questionnaires, what is a
 535 memorable contribution, you have made to the
 536 group that seemed to be productive?

537 Peg Well, I guess, you know the moment was Nora
 538 saying, you know, kind of saying, okay, I am
 539 going to tell her, this is what I think is
 540 missing and this is what I'd like to see added,
 541 and um yeah and you know, I think, really it if I
 542 hadn't *had* the personal relationship part with
 543 their I might not have.

544 MZ That's what was running through my head. That
 545 opened a little place that made that okay, and
 546 look how important it was. So relationships.
 547 Interesting. Was there something you ever said in
 548 terms of conversation or discussion or you
 549 thought of something and you put that out there
 550 and it seemed to really take off and be
 551 interesting for people. If you think back a
 552 little?

553 Peg I don't know. I mean, I just really don't
 554 remember that I did.

555 MZ No? (pause) Ja- jazzed up the discussion a
 556 little, when you threw it out there? I'm not
 557 trying to bait you, but I just.

558 Peg No.

559 MZ Okay, well let me turn the table a little. Was
 560 there ever something you tried to put on the
 561 table, and it just didn't take?

562 Peg I don't think so. I think, you know, um, what
 563 happened was there were a couple of sessions,
 564 where it was especially with all of that um you
 565 know, "plot your- fill out the survey and plot
 566 your- course" (pause). Again, there's nothing
 567 that isn't interesting about that, but there's
 568 nothing new technology about that either. And I
 569 think we had a couple of those back-to-back
 570 sessions. And I was, I think, increasingly uh
 571 withdrawing from, you know, really participating
 572 'cause I'm- well, first of all, I'm there on a
 573 computer- I mean, this is one of the *saving*
 574 *graces*: I go in there and I can do my e-mail,
 575 because they distribute the computers, so I'm
 576 kind of like okay, I'm really not interested in
 577 the Kolb discussion, but on the other hand I can
 578 sit here and do my e-mail, which takes time no
 579 matter what and so I can at least get back to my
 580 office, and I don't have to start with that. So
 581 um I think I had just kind of (pause) gotten
 582 quieter and more pulled back and I'm having this
 583 debate inside of my head, which is, ((Should I))
 584 be in this class? Do I have time to be doing
 585 this? I'm so busy. I'm, you know, and then
 586 (pause) but also clearly, clearly I'm
 587 understanding that it's not like you have nothing
 588 to *learn* in new technology, you have all *kinds* of
 589 things to learn. So that- that kind of sense of
 590 frustration of, you know, I realized that if we
 591 were doing stuff that other people seem to know
 592 all about, it would be a whole different deal
 593 and, you know- so, I- I don't know. I can't
 594 remember where we are in the question here, but-

595 MZ Well, the question was, was there a time that you
 596 wanted to put something [oh-okay!] or tried to
 597 put something out there [so] and they just [no]
 598 didn't hear you.

599 Peg No. The answer is no because I wasn't trying to
 600 do anything. I was just kinda sitting through it
 601 feeling like okay, I guess today I'll just hang
 602 in here and sit through the class. So no, I
 603 wasn't- the one time that I went to Nora and said

604 what I had to say, was all that it took.

605 MZ In terms of the topical discussions, that just
606 change from hour to hour as the things go by, did
607 you ever have an insight and put it out there and
608 just people didn't seem to hear what you said,
609 and it just went past. And there was-

610 Peg I mean no- not so much. I don't- I don't have
611 any big recollection of [okay] "did they just
612 ignore what I have to say?"

613 MZ Would you say then that, uh, generally, what you
614 share gets *heard*?

615 Peg Yeah, I think so. I don't really- you know- if
616 you want to remind me of a certain moment-

617 MZ I'm not really thinking- I'm [yeah] just trying
618 to make, you know-

619 Peg No no no -- I think it's, uh, in that sense it's
620 been good. I mean, I know, um, when Dom has said
621 stuff, I've found it very interesting about how
622 he either approaches his subject area or
623 approaches his students or things like that. I
624 know that some discussions around ((whatever it
625 was)), whether it was Kolb, or I'm not sure what,
626 having to do with how you interact with students,
627 and I thought that was interesting.

628 MZ M-hmm. So here's a way of- for me in wording what
629 I'm trying to get at: all in all, how would you
630 rate the *uptake* of the things that you have put
631 out there in the conversations?

632 Peg Oh, fine. Yeah, appropriate. Fine. I mean, I
633 don't expect anybody to fall out of their chair
634 because of something I said. But y'know, fine.

635 MZ Okay. Good. This is my last formed-up question,
636 here [okay], and that is, how do you feel you
637 have personally, personally benefited from your
638 participation in all of this?

639 Peg Well, um, you know, I'm- after our class on
640 Wednesday, and in our class on Wednesday I'm
641 taking notes, and then I went back to my computer
642 and put them on my computer. You know, "when you
643 teach the course this summer, do podcasting. Do
644 just, and I mean I said this, it's already on the

645 tape, but I teach a course which is called
 646 Writing for Radio and Television. [okay] Oh, and
 647 this course has, you know been on the books since
 648 the mid-80s. And I've taught for a long time.
 649 And I don't teach it significantly different
 650 today, than in 1986, 87. I mean, what's
 651 different, of course, is you're bringing in
 652 current examples and your taping off of the air
 653 this *morning* with whatever, Roberto González or
 654 something, but- um- but it's the *material* that
 655 I'm having them- the *technology*, the way they're
 656 using the technology is videotape and audiotape.
 657 So I'm saying to myself, Okay, you're doing
 658 classes this summer, have them do podcasting-
 659 have them do blogging. Have them take images
 660 from the cell phone and- and you know- right?
 661 The medium- I don't mean necessarily like come to
 662 Starbucks and take images, although they could
 663 create a story about Starbucks and Starbucks
 664 could be in the news for, uh, I don't know what,
 665 you know merging with Google or something like
 666 that, I- you know, um, but in any case, use,
 667 just, you know, right down the line of things
 668 that we were looking at on Wednesday. I mean, I'm
 669 not gonna, *most* likely, I'm not gonna have them
 670 do virtual reality. But even there, you could see
 671 plenty of applications. I'm thinking, I want
 672 James Overwood as a guest speaker. I want them
 673 using the 360° camera. I want Cleve Fraley, is he
 674 from the library?

675 MZ He is, let me think-

676 Peg I think he's from the *library*.

677 MZ No it's not the library.

678 Peg ITS?

679 MZ Yes.

680 Peg Okay. I want to bring Cleve Fraley and- and have
 681 him do, what did he do? I can't remember what he
 682 did. Not so much the bibliography stuff, but
 683 there were a few things that I thought, Oh yeah,
 684 he should come an *do* that. Maybe, I mean, he did
 685 the *blogging* tutorial. I'm sure there's plenty of
 686 stuff he could do. And uh yeah, so that is a *big*
 687 deal. Now, going back to kind of some of the

688 ground that we've been over here before, it's
689 still frustrating for me, because I cannot
690 confidently say, you know, to you, that I mean-
691 for example, I don't own a cell phone.

692 MZ You don't?

693 Peg No. Oh, I actually have one, but it's still in
694 the box. It's been the box for quite a long time.
695 And I don't think it has a camera in it, but it
696 wouldn't matter 'cause it's in the box. So you
697 know (pause), I mean, part of it- well all of it
698 is I really just want somebody right there with
699 me doing the hands-on stuff, so that I literally
700 (()) two or three times and say oh, okay,
701 fine. I get it. And then, for- for people who do
702 a lot. They miss these big, big connections.
703 They say things like "Okay, then you just put it
704 in- then you just upload it. Then you just upload
705 it." Now if you've never done that, you know, you
706 don't just sit down and turn a computer with
707 whatever the key- Bluetooth- you know, Bluetooth-
708 and you've never done it before, and you s- look
709 at the computer and say okay upload this. And
710 it's a very small step, just to plug it in and
711 click click. But if you've never done this step,
712 you're kind of like, remember how- ((coffee
713 machine noises drown out a couple words)) And so
714 I took the blog dot com thing, and I got a blog
715 created. But you know, it told you how the upload
716 the picture, and I could not. I didn't get what
717 they were saying. And my computer, it wouldn't
718 upload the picture. So you now, it's not like
719 it's *intellectually* challenging. It's just really
720 learning the steps and having a kind of comfort
721 level with it. So, you know (pause) I may be
722 going back to Nora to say, okay, can we have a
723 session- or, I mean, I could just say- and Stan
724 and I have talked about this- Oh, 'cause when I
725 walked back I think from that day, that Stan and
726 I um that I- uh spoke with Nora, I think Stan and
727 I walked back here together. I can't remember.
728 But it was a time when Stan and I walked back
729 from COT together, and I was saying, you know
730 it's frustrating me, 'cause I- I really would
731 like to learn, but I just feel like I'm not
732 ((getting enough)) of what I need to do the

733 hands-on stuff. And so, he said, "You know, we
 734 could do- we could take a Monday. And instead of
 735 doing the online- whatever- or whatever it is, we
 736 could just meet in your office, and I could show
 737 you some things." So maybe it takes more than an
 738 hour on a Monday at noon, but still it's that
 739 kind of thing. Somebody really just saying, "Okay
 740 here's the cable, here's the this, here's this.
 741 That's what you need to do," and as- I don't need
 742 my students in the summer to produce something
 743 that's going to be literally on *television*
 744 tonight. But I- I need enough to be able to show
 745 the ones who don't know anything how to do it.
 746 And, and then, you know, you can always say a
 747 small prayer that you get one of those kids in
 748 the class, who knows it all. And then they're
 749 like "Now do this and then do that" and they've
 750 communicated to each other, and they're off to
 751 the races.

752 MZ M-hmm. I've *had* that benefit a few times.

753 Peg Yes yes. Does anybody know what- what I mean, as
 754 the teacher, it's not a good thing-

755 MZ Not the best feeling [no] Hmmm. Do you think then
 756 that you might have Stan up and have him sit down
 757 with you [yeah] because that's what I also
 758 personally need [yeah] to have if someone sits
 759 there next to me and says, "Oh no, don't click
 760 there." [yeah] like, so being aware of those
 761 things in this workshop, whether or not we're yet
 762 *trained* in them, that's a benefit of sorts.

763 Peg Sure. Sure

764 MZ Do you think that'll happen. You'll get Stan up
 765 there [yeah] and have him do-

766 Peg Yes, yeah, yeah.

767 MZ Where would you *start* if you were going to do
 768 that?

769 Peg I would start with this class that I'm- I mean
 770 I'm- I'm scheduled to teach in the summer. It may
 771 get canceled, because if they don't have a
 772 certain number of students, they'll just cancel
 773 it, but that class will um be on my schedule
 774 *sometime* or other. And um, so I think, you know,

775 the podcasting, recording your voice, that's very
 776 simple. And you know, my own background, my very
 777 first real job was in radio news. You know
 778 [really?] so I know that business about what it's
 779 supposed to *sound* like and what is good and when
 780 it's not and how you write this stuff. And so,
 781 you know, I can -- and for students it's a drag
 782 to be using a little old tape recorder, but to do
 783 a podcast, it just puts it in a whole different
 784 light.

785 MZ Mmm. So do you think that might be that something
 786 that you'll start with, how to do a podcast-

787 Peg Podcasting, pod- how to do- yeah, how to do
 788 podcasting, um, and you know, then, you also-
 789 I've done this in different ways, but, with that
 790 idea of podcasting. And you have to listen to
 791 their voice. You know, it's part of it (()) [m-
 792 hmm]. How do you sound? You know, do you *like* how
 793 you sound? Can we *hear* what you have to say? Was
 794 that word pronounced correctly? Did you *use* the
 795 right word? So it's writing, speaking, and
 796 creating a product.

797 MZ Same educational themes.

798 Peg It's all the same.

799 MZ Different technology.

800 Peg Little bit of different technology, which makes a
 801 big difference

802 MZ Hmmmm. Well that's my questions that I had except
 803 that I do have for a closing question one open-
 804 ended thing which is, is there anything that you-
 805 that would come to your mind as you reflect on
 806 the month or two months almost of doing- of
 807 participating in all this that's an *impression* of
 808 yours or a feeling of yours. Or something I
 809 didn't ask about it, but it runs through your-

810 Peg No, no -- I've given you, uh, the whole thing,
 811 and I think, you know, for me, if you were
 812 starting over, and somebody just said, "Give me a
 813 summary, like how did you assess it," I would
 814 say, you know, things that stand out are that we
 815 have this, in an odd way, traditional set up for
 816 something where we're studying all nontraditional

817 stuff. We're studying kind of how learning is
818 changing, and yet we're doing it in a (pause)
819 yeah, typical - here's the teacher in the front
820 of the class and (pause)

821 MZ That's an interesting perc- perception, and no
822 one has really articulated that. [hmm] It's a
823 very- it's a contradiction of sorts.

824 Peg Uh-huh, kind of a contradiction.

825 MZ Hmmmm. I meant to ask someone in here how you felt
826 about being recorded, if that's ever something
827 that runs through your mind. I'm back there with
828 my [no] videocamera (())

829 Peg Completely out of, uh, the radar screen.

830 MZ Yes, it doesn't affect things at all.

831 Peg No, not for me.

832 MZ Okay. Well that's really what I needed to know,
833 Peg. [super!] You're a wonderful interviewer- er,
834 interviewee! [Good!] You're probably a good
835 interviewer, too (both laugh), but I've really
836 enjoyed that. Nice to meet you. I have wanted to
837 talk with you and get to meet you-

838 ((recorder shut off))

APPENDIX G: Participant Consent Form

Name of Study:
In Search of “Dialogue” in Collaborative Curricular Innovation

Principal Investigator: Michael P. Zizzi

PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM
 January 28, 2007

Please read the following material that explains this research study. Signing this form will indicate that you have been informed about the study and that you want to participate. We want you to understand what you are being asked to do and what risks and benefits—if any—are associated with the study. This should help you decide whether or not you want to participate in the study.

You are being asked to take part in a research project conducted by Michael Zizzi, a graduate/undergraduate student in the University of Colorado at Boulder’s Department of Communication, 270 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309-0270. This project is being done under the direction of Professor Karen Tracy, Department of Communication, 270 UCB. Michael Zizzi can be reached by e-mail (michael.zizzi@colorado.edu) or at 303-492-9597. Professor Tracy can be reached at 303-492-8461.

Project Description:

The proposed research will study, using the methodologies of discourse analysis (recording, transcribing, and analyzing naturally-occurring talk) and interviewing, the brainstorming and related discursive (talk-based) processes among project volunteers who are convened for innovative program development. *The intention of the research is to find out what kinds of roles, identities, and “dialogic” processes emerge and function, when invited university members converge and collaborate creatively.*

You are being asked to be in this study because of the opportunity for this research that is presented by your previously-arranged, voluntary participation in the ATLAS/GTP project toward developing a TA course in course-revision. These meeting should prove rich resources for the study of creative collaboration, aka processes of “dialogue.” It is entirely your choice whether or not to participate in this study, which is merely a “side-component” of the project you volunteered to serve. Up to 75 participants will be invited to participate in this research study.

Procedures:

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to simply allow videotaping and/or audiotaping of the course-development meetings in which you have already agreed to participate.

Whereas this process involves no added time commitment from you, you *may* be also asked for a brief (15-30 minutes) follow-up interview, to be held at your convenience. In this interview, which you are free to decline, you will be asked very generally about your experiences and feelings related to your participation in these curriculum-development meetings. These meetings will be held on campus, at a place TBD (possibly in the ATLAS building).

At the end of this form are check-boxes in which you may indicate your permission for your talk and action to be studied for the present research and/or (using a separate check box) for future analysis of the data, since the PI may wish to perform additional analysis in the near future, possibly as doctoral dissertation material.

Risks and Discomforts:

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts in your participation in this research.

Benefits:

There is no foreseeable benefit to be gained as a direct result of your participation in this research, except for the general benefit of aiding research toward the understanding of dialogue as a basis for highly-satisfying human interaction.

If You Are Injured or Harmed:

If you feel that you may have been harmed while participating in this study, you should inform Michael Zizzi by e-mail (michael.zizzi@colorado.edu) or by phone (303-492-9597) immediately. The cost for any treatment will be billed to you or your medical or hospital insurance. The University of Colorado at Boulder has no funds set aside for the payment of health care expenses for this study. If you should find the need to make an injury claim, Colorado State Law allows for claims to be made within 180 days of the discovery of injury (Article 24-10-109).

Ending Your Participation:

You have the right to withdraw your consent or stop participating at any time. You have the right to refuse to answer any question(s) or refuse to participate in any procedure for any reason.

Confidentiality:

We will make every effort to maintain the privacy of your data. Only the PI and research advisors will have access to the recordings made. Other than the researchers, only regulatory agencies such as the Office of Human Research Protections and the University of Colorado Human Research Committee may see your individual data as part of routine audits.

For any recordings that are transcribed, false names and/or code numbers will be used, and only the most basic identifiers will be recorded, such as gender, seniority level (junior faculty / senior faculty, etc.), and type of discipline (social science, etc.).

When analysis is made and written, special care will be taken to assure that no individual suffers any loss of reputation or prestige. Following analysis, any and all raw data (recordings and transcripts) will be securely stored on campus for no longer than three years following research completion, with identifying information and related files securely and separately stored at the PI's home residence.

Questions?

If you have any questions regarding your participation in this research, you should ask the investigator before signing this form. If you should have questions or concerns during or after your participation, please contact Michael Zizzi (michael.zizzi@colorado.edu); phone (303-492-9597).

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project or any dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may report them -- confidentially, if you wish -- to the Executive Secretary, Human Research Committee, 26 UCB, Regent Administrative Center 308, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309-0026, (303) 492-7401.

Authorization:

I have read this paper about the study or it was read to me. I know the possible risks and benefits. I know that being in this study is voluntary. I choose to be in this study. I know that I can withdraw at any time. I have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing 3 pages.

Name of Participant (printed) _____

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____.

(Also, please initial all previous pages of the consent form.)

Consent to be audio and/or videotaped during the participation of this research

_____ Yes, I give permission to be audio and/or video taped during my participation in this research.

_____ No, I do not give permission to be audio and/or video taped during my participation in this research.

Consent to allow follow-up analysis of the data in this study

_____ Yes, I give permission to Michael Zizzi to perform follow-up analysis of the data generated in this research, including my participation, for his doctoral dissertation and related study.

_____No, I do not give permission to Michael Zizzi to perform follow-up analysis of the data generated in this research, including me participation, for his doctoral dissertation and related study.